

Preface.

This volume comprises the lectures delivered as the first series on the T. Verner Moore Foundation at the summer school of the San Francisco Theological Seminary, San Anselmo, California, August 4-9, 1939.

The studies of primitive Christianity which they present confine themselves to the literature of the New Testament. They take for granted the authenticity and trustworthiness of this literature as a picture of what Christianity was and what it strove to be at the outset. It is often said that it was the Church which produced the New Testament, not the New Testament which produced the Church. This is true and yet the truth needs qualification in order that it may not be turned into an untruth. The New Testament Church produced the New Testament but it did not produce Jesus Christ. It was He who produced it. Christianity did not invent the figure of Jesus. On the one hand it was not capable of doing it. The invention would have been more incredible than the fact. On the other hand, as Borchert has shown in "The Original Jesus", if men in the first century had sought to invent an ideal figure, it never would have entered into their minds to invent the Jesus of the Gospels. But while it is true that the Church produced not Christ but the New Testament, this very fact is what gives significance to the New Testament portrait of primitive Christianity. This is what primitive Christianity was or wanted to be thought to be. Any criticism of the New Testament documents leaves their value for the purposes of *these* studies unaffected.

Primitive Christianity as conceived here is, accordingly, the Christianity of the first century. The developments of doctrine and organization and life, and of the application of the Christian principles and spirit to social and moral problems, which came later may or may not have been legitimate. Newman in his doctrine of Development may ~~or may not~~ have been wrong or he may have been in part right and in part wrong. That question is not considered here. The conviction underlying these lectures is that the only true test of the legitimacy of any developments of the centuries which followed the first is their conformity to the authority of the New Testament in its representation of the mind of Christ and its interpretation of that mind in the words of the New Testament, written with full adequacy to this purpose "that ye might believe that Jesus Christ, ^{is the} Son of God, and that believing ye might have life in His Name."

I am grateful to the *Dleming St. Revell Co.* for permission to use in these lectures some studies of the mind of Christ in "The Principles of Jesus", of the relation of New Testament Christianity to the idea of race in "Race and Race Relations" and of the attitude of the Church of the first century toward non-Christian religions and of its conception of Christ from "The Finality of Jesus Christ". The last two lectures in the book embody the substance of chapters *two* and one of "The Finality of Jesus Christ", so far as these deal with the New Testament documents.

The Church in the House.

The last chapter of the Epistle to the Romans is one of the most interesting and instructive chapters in the New Testament, and one of the most illuminating with regard to the character of primitive Christianity. At first sight it may appear to be only a list of names, like the lists in the First Book of Chronicles in the Old Testament, of unknown and forgotten persons to whom Paul sends greetings from the church in Corinth. But a few moments of reflection suffice to show how full of suggestion and how fascinating this list of names really is.

In the first place it shows how large a place women filled in Paul's friendships and in his thought of the Church. There are thirty five names in the chapter and with "the mother of Rufus" there are thirty six. Of these two, Aristobulus and Narcissus, are the names of the heads of households, probably not themselves Christians, to which some of the Christians named belonged either as servants or kinsmen, most probably as servants. This leaves thirty four of Paul's friends and of these eight and perhaps nine were women. The first two names mentioned are the names of women, Phoebe and Priscilla, both remarkable women whom Paul held in high regard. Phoebe was a woman of influence and standing in the church at Cenchreae, the eastern part of Corinth, about nine miles from the city, important as a fortress and an emporium of trade. Paul calls her "our sister" i. e. "my sister in Christ and yours also". He acknowledges his obligations to her, and unqualifiedly commends her on the important mission, probably some legal business, on which she is going to Rome. It is very probable, as the note attached to the Epistle in the King James Version states, that Phoebe was the bearer of this Epistle to the church in Rome. It is an evidence of Paul's confidence in women that he entrusted to a woman messenger the most important letter ever written, the most influential piece of literature except the four Gospels.

The second name in the chapter is the name of one of the most remarkable characters in the New Testament, another woman, Prisca as she is called here and in II Tim. IV, 19, or Priscilla, a diminutive or familiar name, as she is called in Acts XVIII, 2, 18, 26 and in I Cor. XVI, 19. Her name is placed before that of her husband in this chapter and also in Acts XVIII, 18 and in II Tim. IV, 19, perhaps because, as Chrysostom thought, she was the more fervent in spirit. She and her husband were of the same tent-making trade as Paul, and he lived and worked with them in Corinth during his long stay of eighteen months or more there. It was perhaps here, in the insurrection which the Jews made against Paul, that these two devoted friends risked their own lives for him. When he finally left Corinth they accompanied him to Ephesus and remained there when Paul went on to Jerusalem and thence to Antioch to his old friends. It was at Ephesus that Aquila and Priscilla met another of the remarkable personalities of the early Church, Apollos whom they took under their instruction though he was already "an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures". It is notable that half the faculty of this first theological school was a woman. And Harnack even conjectures that Priscilla may have been the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews.

The other women mentioned are of great interest also: Mary, "who bestowed much labor upon us" or "upon you"; the mother of Rufus, "his mother and mine", perhaps the widow of Simon of Cyrene who bore Jesus' cross (Mark XV, 21); the sisters, Tryphena and Tryphosa, names found in connection with the imperial household and meaning "dainty" or "luxurious", who "toiled in the Lord"; Persis "the beloved", and others. The idea that Paul disapproved of woman's activity and prominence in the Church gets no support from this picture of his regard and praise for Christian women.

A second significant bit of information of this chapter has to do with Paul's own family relationships. He sends greetings to "Andronicus and Junia (or Junias) my kinsmen and my fellow prisoners, who are well known to the apostles, who also have been in Christ before me," and to "Herodion, my kinsman", and among those who are with him in Corinth and whose greetings he sends to Rome he names "Lucius and Jason and Sosipater",

My Kinsmen". It is maintained by some that Paul does not mean that these six persons were blood relatives but only that, as he was writing to a *gentile* Church, he distinguished these six as "kinsmen according to the flesh", i. e. fellow Jews as in Rom. IX, 3. But Aquila and Priscilla were Jews and most probably many of "them of Aristobulus", i. e. of his servants, would be Jews, if he was the Aristobulus who was grandson of Herod the Great and who lived in Rome; and Timothy's mother was a Jewess. Paul names all of these and others who may have been Jews but he does not call them his "kinsmen". If the six whom he does so designate were his blood relations, two interesting inferences suggest themselves: one, that Paul had not failed to seek to win his own flesh and blood to Christ, and even more significant, ~~more~~ ^{that} some of his own family became Christians before he did. What light this throws on Paul's persecuting fury and his own *conversion*! Already there were hidden misgivings and questionings in his own soul which his persecuting fervor was covering over. Before even Christ met him on the Damascus road his own conscience was goading him. (Acts. IX, 5; ~~IV.~~)

"Who lights the fagot? Not the full faith, XXVI, 14.

No, but the lurking doubt."

Had Andronicus and Junia been already pleading with him? Was he going to Damascus to avoid attack upon his own kindred in Jerusalem? What were the names of that sister and nephew to whom perhaps, he owed his life in Jerusalem (Acts XXIII, 16-22)? How much there is in Paul's life, hinted at in the *New Testament* which we should like to know! A little of it one may guess from this list of names.

~~and~~ In the third place, we see and feel here some thing of the democracy of the early Christian community and its freedom of movement, Jason we meet both here ~~and~~ in Corinth and at Thessalonica (Acts XVII, 5). Timothy we meet in many places, Aquila and Priscilla in Rome (V.3) at Corinth (Acts XVIII, 6-18), in Ephesus (Acts XVIII, 24-26); Sosipater, or Sopater, at Corinth, as here, and at *Beroea* and traveling with Paul from Ephesus "as far as Asia" (Acts XX, 4). Persecution and *evangelization* made the early Church a very mobile body, and also a very democratic fellowship. In this list are the names of servants or freemen of households *close* to Caesar, of craftsmen like Aquila and his wife (or perhaps better, Priscilla and her husband), of a man of property like *Gaius* whose hospitality embraced the entire Christian community at Corinth, of *Erastus*, the city chamberlain or treasurer, and *Quartus*, perhaps a slave, "Number Four", called simply "a brother". The mention of *Tertius* and of *Quartus* is a lovely touch. *Tertius* was the amanuensis to whom Paul dictated the letter. Perhaps Paul paused at this point, and *Tertius* took advantage of the pause to speak for himself, never realizing the immortality he was securing, or perhaps Paul suggested his sending a greeting in his own name. "To have sent his greeting in the Third Person", says Gifford in his commentary on Romans, "would have been to treat him as a mere machine (Godet). We have therefore in this little detail an instance of St. Paul's characteristic courtesy, and at the same time a strong proof of the genuineness of the passage, for what *forger* would have thought of introducing such an incident?"

And as to "Quartus, a brother" there is a lovely "week day address" of Dr. Alexander Maclaren on this text: "Among all these people of mark", says Dr. Maclaren, "comes the modest, quiet Quartus. He has no wealth like *Gaius*, nor *high* position like *Erastus*, nor wide reputation like Timothy. He is only a good, simple unknown Christian. He feels a spring of love open in his heart to these brethren far across the sea whom he never met. He would like them to know that he thought lovingly of them, and to be lovingly thought of by them. So he begs a little corner in Paul's letter, and gets it; and there in his little niche, like some *statue* of a forgotten saint, scarce seen amidst the glories of a great cathedral, 'Quartus a brother' stands to all time.... A little incident of this sort is more impressive than any amount of mere talk about the uniting influence of the Gospel... It is impossible for us to throw ourselves completely back to the condition of things which the Gospel found.... Great gulfs of national hatred, of ~~them~~ fierce enmities of race, language and religion; wide separations of social

condition, far profounder than anything of the sort which we know, split mankind into fragments....Into this hideous condition of things the Gospel comes, and silently flings its clasping tendrils over the wide gaps and binds the crumbling structure of human society with a new bond, real and ~~the~~ living. We know well enough that that was so, but we are helped to apprehend by seeing, as it were, the very process going on before our eyes, in this message from 'Quartus, a brother'.

"It reminds us that the very notion of humanity and of the brotherhood of man, is purely Christian. A world-embracing society, held together by love was not dreamt of before the Gospel came; and since the Gospel came it is more than a dream. If you wrench away the idea from its foundation, as people do who talk about fraternity, and seek to bring it to pass without Christ, it is a mere piece of Utopian sentiment - a fine dream. But in Christianity it worked. It works imperfectly enough, God knows. Still ~~there~~ there is some reality in it, and some power. The Gospel first of all ~~produced~~ produced the thing and the practice, and then the theory came afterwards. The Church did not talk much about the brotherhood of man, or the unity of the race; but simply ignored all distinctions, and gathered into the fold the slave and his master, the Roman and his subject, fair-haired *Goths* and swarthy Arabians, the worshippers of Odin and of Zeus, the Jew and the Gentile. That actual unity, utterly irrespective of all distinctions, which came naturally in the train of the Gospel, was the first attempt to realize the oneness of the race, and first taught the world that all men were brethren...

"Let us seek that like Quartus - all else about us being forgotten, position, talents, wealth buried in the dust - we may be remembered, if we are remembered at all, by such a biography as is condensed unto these three words... A *sweet* fate to live forever in the world's memory by three words which tell his name, his Christianity, and his brotherly love."

But now there is a fourth significant thing in this list of names and characterizations which really gathers up in *itself* all three other lessons. It is the concept of "The Church in the House."

Paul sends greetings to Priscilla and Aquila in Rome and to "The church that is in their house." And this institution of the church in the house was one of the richest and most *meaningful* ideas of *primitive* Christianity and ^{was} evidently common and widely prevalent. When Paul writes his First Letter to the Corinthians from Ephesus, "Aquila and Prisca" are with him there and send their salutations "with the church that is in their house." Apparently wherever this remarkable couple went their home was a centre of Christian fellowship and worship. ~~But~~ But the institution of a home church was not peculiar to them. Gaius's house in Corinth seems to have been a house-church. (Rom. XVI, 23). In his letter to the Colossians Paul sends greetings to Nymphas and "the church that is in ~~her~~ house" (Col. IV, 15 R. V. *margin*), and to Philemon he writes, not to Philemon only but, also, "to the church in thy house" (V. 1).

It is easy to understand the development of this idea of the church in the house. Even while the early Christians were still allowed in the Temple and the Synagogue they carried their new faith and life into household observance. "And day by day, continuing stedfastly with one accord in the Temple, and breaking bread at home, they took their food with gladness and singleness of heart." (Acts II, 40). "And every day in the Temple and at home they ceased not to teach and to preach". (Acts V, 42). When Peter was delivered from prison "he came to the house of Mary, the mother of John whose surname was Mark, where many were gathered together and were praying". (Acts XII, 12). It was not long before their homes were the only available churches. On His last evening with His disciples, Jesus had told them what was to happen to them: "They shall put you out of the synagogues: yea, the hour cometh that whosoever killeth you shall think that he offereth service unto God" (John XVI, 2). That hour came very quickly and their own houses were the only places possible for their gatherings and their common worship. It was a long time before church buildings came. "There is no

clear example of a separate building set apart for Christian worship", says Bishop Lightfoot, "within the limits of the Roman Empire before the third century, though apartments in private houses might be specially devoted to that purpose."

In part, no doubt, economic conditions, the poverty of the early Christians, and the *persecutions* which drove them into retirement ordained the course which was pursued. But even more it was the very nature of Christianity which took this expression and domesticated the new faith in the heart of family life and in the home. And no aspect or conception of Christianity stands in greater need of recovery today when the family *house* and the family *circle* are in peril of disappearance.

"The Church in the house" is a revelation of what primitive Christianity really was. It bears witness to its genuineness, ~~the~~ *reality* and ~~its~~ *vitality* and penetrative power.

It endured the test of home and the *scrutiny* of home people. There are many tests which true religion must meet in the forum, in the university, in the market place, among the social, economic and political problems which confront and challenge it, but there are none more exacting or conclusive than the tests of family life and relationships. Many years ago I ~~when~~ attended a state convention of railroad and college Young Man's Christian Associations in Lancaster, Pennsylvania. It was the good custom of those days to bring together these two particular groups. It was a good thing for each group to mingle with the other. At one evening meeting the railroad men were bearing their own simple *witness* to what Christianity meant to them. Mr. Pugh, one of the vice-presidents of the Pennsylvania Railroad, was presiding and a little railroad engineer was speaking. In the midst of his testimony to the change which Christ had made in his life and the control which He had brought of temper and self-will, he suddenly paused and with a chuckle pointed up to the gallery and said, "If you don't believe it, ask my wife. She's sitting right up there." That was *appeal* to authoritative and conclusive evidence, ~~that the court of last resort.~~

In one of the noblest dedications that can be found, Mrs. Charles Kingley's dedication of her biography of her husband, the noblest note is the reference to this judgment of *home* intimacy on the reality of ~~character~~ character:

"To the Beloved Memory
of

A Righteous Man

Who loved God and truth above all things

A man of untarnished honor -

Loyal and chivalrous - gentle and strong -

Modest and humble - tender and true

Pitiful to the weak - yearning after the erring -

Stern to all forms of wrong and oppression,

Yet most stern towards himself -

Who being angry yet sinned not.

Whose highest virtues were known only

To his wife, his children, his servants and the poor.

Who lived in the presence of God here,

And passing through the grave and gate of death

Now liveth unto God forevermore."

"Whose highest virtues were known only to his wife, his children, ^{his} the servants and the poor" - there is the authentic and irrefutable evidence. This is the court of authoritative judgment. "Oh", said a lad of childish candor about a slippery father, who was of reputable standing in public, "he said that, did he? Well I know his tricks." Out of the mouths of *babes* and sucklings something beside praise is ordained.

This is the test which primitive Christianity was called to meet at the outset. It was to become, and it did become, the law and spirit of the home. The church was the family. Paul's Epistles make this unmistakably clear. "Husbands love your wives, even as Christ also loved the Church and gave

himself up for it." This sacrament of marriage Paul chose as symbol of the great mystery. "This mystery is great", he says, "but I speak in regard of Christ and His Church." The worst of all schisms in the Church is any rupture of the Church in the house. And this unity of love included the relations of parent and child: "Children obey your parents in the Lord; for this is right. And, ye fathers provoke not your children to wrath; but nurture them in the fear and admonition of the Lord".

This, then, was where Christianity began - in the home. Love in the home was necessary to love out of the home. And because Christianity was a fountain of love and trust in the family life, "in the house", it poured forth as a reality into the life of the world. Its power and truth ~~was~~ were first proved in the most searching crucible of home relationships. John presses the necessity and the significance of this ~~remotely~~ *remotely*. In his First Epistle brotherly love was the proof of Christianity; "We know that we have passed out of death into life because we love the brethren. Whosoever hateth his brother is a murderer, and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him... He that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen cannot love God whom he hath not seen". (I John III, 14, 15, 20). Primitive Christianity, as we see it in the New Testament, sought to be true to Jesus *John's* appeal for love and perfect confidence in the family. It is true that the brotherly relations contemplated by Jesus and John reached beyond the family tie but all the more they included and involved this. "It is useless", said the author of *Ecce Homo*, "to tell a man to love all mankind if he never loved any individual of mankind and only knows by report what love is. It should be recognized that family affection in some form is the almost indispensable root of Christianity."

"The Church in the House" witnessed to the genuineness, the simplicity, the domesticity of Christianity, at the outset. The sacramental and sacerdotal aspects of Christianity were developments of later antiquity. A true appeal to antiquity such as ~~was intended~~ *was intended* to be made by the Tractarian *warment* would have to go behind those developments to the unecclesiastical artlessness of the house-church. At the beginning there were no consecrated buildings, no formal altars, no vestments, no *Rubrics* of sacramental procedure, no church year with sacred times. The home and the family were the centre and the *form* and *constituted* the working unit and principle of Christianity and its *evangelizing* force.

I should like to emphasize this by recalling the last sermon written by a dear friend, Dr. William R. Richards, at the time of his death in 19 ~~19~~ *19* ~~sermon~~ *pastor* was on this very phrase, "The Church in the House", and was found on his desk fully written out and ready for the Sunday which followed his death. Dr. Henry Van Dyke read the sermon on that Sunday morning. Dr. Richards was one of the ablest men in the ministry in America and a true *and original* scholar in his study of New Testament Christianity:

"The phrase carries us back to that time of humble beginnings, when the Christian Church could not provide itself a great public assembly hall, but the shelter of some good man's house would be the only available shelter. The second chapter of the Acts shows how it was in Jerusalem just after Pentecost. The disciples, like other devout Jews still took part in the national worship in the Temple, but we learn that in their own distinctive ~~Church~~ Christian customs they must turn to those of their number who had private houses in that city. It says they broke bread (as their Lord had bidden them do in remembrance of him) from house to house, the beginning of Christian worship. A little later, when the outbreak of persecution had forced a greater secrecy upon them, it appears that one house in particular had been selected. When their leader Peter was cast into prison, we find many of the disciples gathered day after day behind locked doors to pray for him in the house of the mother of John Mark.

"Still later, a good many years, at the time when Paul made his last journey to Jerusalem, it appears that the house of James had now come to be the chief meeting place for the Christians in that city. If you follow

the history to other cities; in Philippi the house of Lydia is a recognized meeting place for the disciples; a few miles away in Thessalonica it is the house of Jason; down in Corinth and at another time in Rome it is the house of Aquila and Priscilla; in Laodicea the house of Nymphas, and in Colossae the house of Philemon. In the larger cities, like Corinth or Ephesus or Rome, where the number of disciples soon became very large, there is reason to suppose that many of the disciples would offer their houses for this purpose, as Paul says that in Ephesus he had taught 'from house to house,' going from one of these little Christian congregations to another.

"As time went on, with the further growth of the Church and especially after the fear of persecution had passed away, the Christians would need and would provide themselves with more spacious assembly places. After the conversion of Constantine we know that the public halls (Basilica) or court houses of the cities were often adopted for this purpose, so that even this old classic name, Basilica, came over and has made a permanent place for itself in Christian architecture. But all this was generations later; the earliest place of Christian worship was some good man's or good woman's house. The Christian Church was born in a home, and from this domestic origin it gained certain qualities at the start which we hope it may never lose.

"I should like to call your attention to a few of these qualities; what we might call the domestic qualities of the Christian religion, and we shall be interested ~~in these qualities~~ to see how these manifested themselves in that early period, which we might call the domestic period of the church's history.

"First, will you take this group of passages: 'And when she, Lydia, was baptized and her household, she besought us, etc.'; 'And Paul and Silas said to the jailer, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house"....and he was baptized, he and all his.' And again Paul writes, 'I baptized the household of Stephanas.' If we were speaking of the ordinance of Christian Baptism, such passages as these would furnish strong evidence that a Christian man has a right to claim that ordinance ~~man~~ for the children of his household as well as for himself. But just at present I am not discussing the sacrament; we are thinking more of the spiritual realities which lie back of the sacrament. The evident fact is that in those earliest days the apostles expected a man's conversion generally to carry his household with him. If the jailer of Philippi believed, he would be saved and his house; not because his faith would save an unbelieving household, but because it was fair to assume that if he believed they would soon believe also. A man's conversion would introduce such changes in the whole custom and spirit of his home that it was fair to assume that the other members of that home would share or quickly follow the conversion.

"Evidently those early Christian workers rested on that expectation. If they could gain to Christ the man, they would count that they had also gained his house; for they looked to him to gain the house. From the moment of his own sincerely believing his house became a little church. The whole existing machinery of the family life, just as soon as it had been hallowed by the man's own faith and prayer, would begin at once to create faith ~~and~~ in the members of the family. The natural authority of the house, and the natural affection and loyalty of their many common interests; the daily habit of mutual helpfulness; all these are present in any normal home, waiting to be utilized as a most powerful agency for evangelization. So where the apostles by their own personal preaching might have gained a single convert, they could trust him, by the changing of his home into a church and the utilizing of its most effective machinery, to gain other converts, a half-dozen or so--a little church.

"With that kind of following up of the work of the apostolic missionaries, do you wonder that Christianity spread itself swiftly over the earth in those days? This very growth made it necessary before long for the church to supply herself with vaster assembly halls and a more extensive organization of missions and philanthropic activities; but we must not lose sight

of this great truth which was drilled into her at the start; namely, that the most effective and trustworthy of all the agencies for winning and raising up Christians in this world is the Christian home; the first and best of all churches in the church in the house. Once lost sight of that and everything else in your Christianity must soon come to an end; but keep that church in the house, and even though you had lost all the products of Christianity development you would simply be back where Christianity was, at the outset, and you might expect to start out and win the world again. So the first characteristic of Christianity that we note as coming down from this early domestic period is that in those days when a man who was a householder had been himself converted, they expected him to order his home in such a way that conversion would bring his household with him."

Just as all life is cellular, biology knowing nothing of life apart from cells, so Christianity began with the home not the church, or rather with the church in the home, as its unit of life and power. It was into this basic human institution of the family that Christianity at once penetrated, and by its penetration ~~has~~ ^{has} witnessed to its vitality and its fearlessness to grapple with all the actual relations of man in social life. It did indeed reach beyond our human life into the superhuman. Paul's great Epistles begin with theology. He carries us behind time to the foundation of the world and beyond time into eternity but back he comes in ^{every} ~~case~~ ^{case} to sociology, to reef his spiritual principle into the problems of our life on earth, the problems of family life, of the relation of master and servant, of citizen and foreigner, of the individual and society.

Assuredly we need ^{today} to recover and retain the characteristics of Christianity embodied in the primitive conception of the church in the house. Christianity is not one of many ideals of life which may be chosen or rejected as the individual taste or temper may decide. It is not an optional affair for which one man "goes in" and which another passes by. It belongs to the integrity of life. Every man lives in some sort of an ^{abode} ~~abode~~. That is his house and it is no ^{true} ~~true~~ house if it is not a Christian church. Indeed in the vivid and accurate metaphors of the New Testament ^{every} ~~every~~ man is a ^{house} ~~house~~. Tennyson speaks of the house of a beast loaned to the soul of a ~~the~~ man. Paul conceives the ^{body} ~~house~~ as a temple. Every man's body ^{is} ~~is~~ to be a temple of the Spirit of God. That is the primitive Christian ideal, the true notion of man. Those who reject it, reject the truth about themselves, their own noblest and essential nature. In the novel "Queed", Klinker, the ex-prize fighter is speaking: "Presently Klinker said another thing that his friend, the little doctor, remembered for a long time. 'Do you know what's the finest line in Scripture, Doc?' 'But he spoke of the temple of His body.' I heard a minister get that off in a church once, in a sermon. And I don't guess I'll ever forget it. A dandy, ain't it?...Keep your temple strong and clean. If I was a parson, I tell you, I'd go right to Seventh and Centre next ^{Sunday} ~~Sunday~~ and give a talk to them blaggards on that." "But He spoke of...."'. The uncleanness, indecency, low mindedness and shameful shamelessness of modern life would disappear from a society of men whose ideal of the house of the body took on the sanctity of the church.

"Put to death therefore your members which are upon the earth: fornication, uncleanness, passion, evil desire, and covetousness, which is idolatry; for which things' sake cometh the wrath of God upon the sons of disobedience: wherein ye also once walked, when ye lived in these things; but now do ye also put them all away: anger, wrath, malice, railing, shameful speaking out of your mouth: lie not one to another; seeing that ye have put off the old man with his doings, and have put on the new man, that is being renewed unto knowledge after the image of him that created him." (Col. III, 5 - 10).

And Christianity is not only the sole legitimate principle of each individual whether he acknowledges it or not, it is also, as this concept of the house-church indicates, for every day and all time. Indeed it would seem that for a time the early Church had no special days or times. The observance of the Jewish Seventh day Sabbath faded out and it was long before the Christian first day took on a distinct sacred character. There is

no evidence of any fixed sacramental or ecclesiastical times in the New Testament. There is ^{only} one mention of "the Lord's Day" (Rev. I, 10) apart from the eschatological references. ^{to the day of the Lord} The only mention of "the first day of the week" is in connection with Christian stewardship (I Cor. XVI, 2) and with Paul's preaching at Troas (Acts XX, 7). On this occasion it is stated that the disciples "were gathered together to break bread", but the early Church in Jerusalem appears to have both preached and broken bread daily and the bread breaking was "at home" (Acts II, 42, 46; V, 42). And in his letter to the Colossians Paul warns against the tendency which had begun to ordain seasons and ceremonies and austerities. (~~Col. II, 23~~)

"Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a feast day or a new moon or a sabbath day: which are a shadow of the things to come; but the body is Christ's. Let no man rob you of your prize by a voluntary humility and worshipping of the angels, dwelling in the things which he hath seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding fast the Head, from whom all the body, being supplied and knit together through the joints and bands, increaseth with the increase of God. If ye died with Christ from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, do ye subject yourselves to ordinances, Handle not, nor taste, nor touch (all which things are to perish with the using), after the precepts and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship, and humility, and severity to the body; but are not of any value against the indulgence of the flesh." (Col. II, 16-23)

He enjoins instead the simple spiritual realities of life dwelling in and indwelt by God, the elemental religion of the church in the house, of the Incarnation itself, of God in our human habitation.

"If then ye were raised together with Christ, seek the things that are above, where Christ is, seated on the right hand of God. Set your mind on the things that are above, not on the things that are upon the earth. For ye died, and your life is hid with Christ in God. When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory." (Col. III, 1-4).

It is not without significance that when the Head of the Church came into the house of humanity He went so far that He was accused of violating the Sabbath Day and the sacramental customs of His people and of disrespect for the Temple. John V, 18. LXIII, 10-16, Mark VII, 2, John II, 20, Mark XIV, 58.

All this is not to say that there is no room in Christian worship for the developments of later years, for the use of architecture and art, for ritual and even for sacramental ideas and the elaborate Cultus of a reverent High Church. The Tractarian Movement, following the Wesley revival and the Evangelical awakening, made a real contribution and its continued influence makes a real contribution today to the dignity and reverence of Christian worship. ~~and~~ One needs only to recall the condition of Church life in England in Jane Austen's time to realize how much we owe to the forces that redeemed Christianity and the Church from their decadence.
 "At the end of the eighteenth century the Church (of England) was at its deadest, enthusiasm there was none. Torpid is the only word that fitly describes the spiritual condition of the majority of the clergy. Secker says, 'An open and professed disregard of religion is become, through a variety of unhappy causes, the distinguishing character of the present age', and the clergy ~~are~~ the salt of the earth had already lost their savor, and did little or nothing to resist an apathy which, too commonly, extended to themselves.... The churches were for the most part damp and mouldy; there were, of course, none of the present conveniences for heating and lighting. Heavy galleries cut off the little light that struggled through the cobwebby windows. There were mouse-eaten hassocks, curtains on roads thick with dust, a ground smell of mouldiness and disuse, and a cold but ill-ventilated stagnant atmosphere.... The sermons were peculiarly dry and dull and it would have taken a clever man to suck any spiritual nourishment therefrom. They were generally on points of doctrine, read without modulation; and if as was frequently the case, the clergyman had not the energy to prepare his own a ser-

mon from any drear collection sufficed". (Milton, "Jane Austen ^{and} Her Times", p. 37f).

Any movement was welcome that helped to break up this stagnation. But what ~~was~~ needed most of all was the recovery of the genuine "Church in the House". When there is a true church in the house there will be a true church in the Church.

This simple primitive conception reminds us also that Christianity was and is for the little things of life. Life indeed is just these little ~~things~~ things. They are the things of real consequence. "Chinese" Gordon was always saying this. He wrote in his "Letters to his Sisters": from the ~~Soudan~~ ^{Soudan} in 1875, "We are much more important than we have any idea of. Nothing is trivial that is unseen"; from Aden in 1880, "What we need is a profound faith in God's ruling all things. It is not the Duke or Lord ~~Beaconsfield~~ ; it is He alone who rules. Napoleon in a book lent me by Watson says, 'The smallest trifles produce the greatest results'; and from Jaffa in 1883, "Everyone is doing work quite as important as anyone else, whether on a sick bed or as Viceroy of India; it is folly which makes us think otherwise." It is on little things that the Judgment Day is to turn at last - things so ordinary and homely and small that man will have forgotten them. (Matt. XXIII 31-46) And it is in little things that we are to practice our Christian faith and have dealings with God. As Ruskin says in "The Seven Lamps of Architecture": "We treat God with irreverence when we banish Him from our thoughts, not by referring to His will on slight occasions. His is not the finite authority or intelligence which cannot be troubled with small things. There is nothing so small but that we may ~~know~~ ^{honor} God by asking His guidance of it, or insult Him by taking it into our own hands".

And so also the family-house nature of the church brings under the cover of both the sanction and inspiration of Christianity, the common occasions which are the warp on which we weave the web of our actual human life. Horace Bushnell set this ~~path~~ ^{path} in one of ~~our~~ ^{his} greatest sermons, "Our Duty to Live to God in Common Occasions and in Small Things".

But above all "the church in the house" reveals the essentially family nature of Christianity and also it provided Christianity with its two great family metaphors of father and brother. We shall see later what Christianity did for the family in its ideal of womanhood and motherhood, but we need to note what confirmation the church in the house gave to the two great conceptions of our Lord, "of God ~~as~~ ^{as} Father - "My Father and your Father", and of man as brother - "And all ye are brethren". I would recall again the sermon of Dr. Richards which will not be otherwise ~~preserved~~ ^{preserved} :

"Another characteristic" said he, "that comes down from that same domestic period is that so long as the church was a church in the house the terms 'father' and 'brother' were alive with definite, practical meaning, and these two terms, you know, are the great terms of Christian doctrine. The fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man--if any one could really understand all that those two phrases mean there would be nothing more to ask, I suppose. You would then have the whole Christian revelation. What is the progress of Christian theology if not the more accurate definition of these two phrases, the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man?"

"Those two great doctrinal controversies of the third and fourth centuries, which exercised the brains and the tempers of the early fathers, of Sabellius and Origen and Arius and Athanasius, and the rest, resulting in ~~the~~ the Nicene Creed, with its later amendments or additions, were waged chiefly over the question what it had meant when Jesus called God his Father. But this first question must necessarily draw with it the further question, what it should mean when this same Jesus Authorizes us also to call God our ~~Father~~ ^{Father}, being himself not ashamed to call us his brethren.

"Now, I suppose those long continued discussions and controversies had their use; I suppose they added something to the clearness of theological thinking, and may be of permanent service, as they help to guard us against certain forms of theological error. And yet, if you compare the Christianity of those scheming, ecclesiastical politicians whom Constantine summoned to his great council at Nicea with the Christianity of Aquila and Priscilla and Lydia and Philemon, and the others to whom Paul and Peter and John preached

and wrote their letters, you must feel that the later type of religion was in some respects far inferior to the earlier. If those later Christians had gained something in intellectual keenness, they had lost far more in purity and warmth of devotion, and by losing this they had also lost in real spiritual insight....

"It is all as far as possible from any cold abstraction of philosophy; the words are concrete and all alive with meaning. This friend of Jesus, the head of this house, whose own faith has meant so much in the home that as a matter of course it has made believers of wife and children and servants and all the rest of the household, he is the father of that family. And what you and they know of him, that is what you are all thinking of when you lift up your faces toward heaven and pray to our Father God, so that first domestic stage in the Church's life gave the best possible opportunity for learning the true meaning of this domestic name, father.

"Well, so for the other name through which Christ has taught us the other half of his Gospel--brother, another domestic term, you see. The brotherhood of man had a very real meaning for the little Christian when the only human beings he had much to do with, except his father and mother, were his literal brothers and sisters--the other members of that church in the house. With that for a start he could not go far astray, when as he grew older and went outdoors he learned that all other Christians were brothers, too; yes, and all the other men and women for whom Christ died, all the other children of our Father God, all are brothers.

"But, if you ask what that must involve in my feeling and conduct toward them all, my mind jumps straight back to those simpler problems of the church in the house when Peter had to deal with little brother Andrew, and John with big brother James. If each of us can start over again there at the beginning, thus consciously renewing our contact with the concrete reality of literal human brotherhood, then we may hope to carry the idea with us through such an immense expansion as this Laymen's Missionary Movement, aiming at nothing less than the brotherhood of all mankind; and, with so vital a start, we may hope to keep it a real, living brotherhood to the end. So this is the second of the domestic qualities of our Christian religion which have come down to us from that domestic period in the Church's history. It is embodied in these two great phrases of Christian doctrine--father, brother; the fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man--father, brother both of them terms of the home."

If we lose the church in the house we lose the very essence of Christianity as an institution in human life. The nearest approach to the ideal of heaven, which Jesus described as "my Father's house", is an earthly home with its family worship, its grace at meals, its love and trust and discipline and purity and peace. We need church buildings, but we need even more church houses. If we have to dispense with one, we can better dispense with the first. Of heaven itself John said, "I saw no temple therein". Why? "For the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb are the temple thereof".

All this is hard, much harder than a religion of times and places and forms. Christianity when it is full and true can use these and subordinate them. But its essence is not in these things but in spirit, in personal relations, the soul and God, God and the soul, man and his brother, parent and child, *husband and wife, friend and friend, living and loving in the family of God.*

Domesticated in the house it is the symbol and foretaste of the House not made with hands eternal in the heavens. Many years ago in *Hangchow*, China, two missionaries built a simple home. It was plain as plain could be but it was spotlessly clean and it was full of love. Mrs. Mattox was accustomed to gather into the home the waifs from the street, to feed them, to teach them of Christ, and to sing, to bring into ~~their drab little lives~~ some brightness and joy. Once a pious visitor speaking to the children described heaven to them without its name and with homiletical intent asked them at the close, "Now children where would you like to go when you die?" With one voice they answered, "To Mrs. Mattox's house." What is a true church in the house but a bit of heaven anticipated on earth? It was with this thought that Dr. Richards ended his sermon: "It is a chapter of history that we have been studying this morning, very ancient history; and

it has taught its own lessons as we have gone along, without much need of practical application at the end. You have seen that the lessons look both ways. On the one hand, the Christian Church, having been born in some good man's house, is never to lose the dear and gracious characteristics of the home. On the other hand, the home, your home and mine, since this most holy thing has been born there, must always retain for us all the sacredness of the church. Every human father's house where he gathers his own children about him, being hallowed by faith and prayer, is none other than the house of God and the gate of heaven."

It was because Christianity first of all built the church in the house that it produced the Christian home the richest and most fruitful social institution ever known. This is what fundamentally a home is - the church in the house. If in the home, then also in the heart; for the heart, the body, is the temple, the home where God would have His church. How good that this can be? That the *Incarnation is to be perpetual*, Christ in our ~~houses~~ house and heart today as *truly* as in ~~Bible~~ *Bethlehem* and under Mary's heart. How good! And how tragic to miss it and how sad! For Christ is waiting to find His Church in our house and His house in our hearts. "Behold I stand at the door and knock". *this was what Christianity was when it began.*

The Place of Christ in the Thought and Life
of the Early Church.

.....

We have considered in the last chapter the question of primitive Christianity's relation to "other religions" and it is difficult not to make this concession to the popular use of the word "religion". But in reality Christianity is not a religion. The word religion does not occur in the four Gospels. Jesus never used it. And it is used only five times in the rest of the New Testament, three times by Paul (Acts XXVI, 5; Gal. I, 13, 14), each time referring to "the Jews' religion", and twice by James (James I, 26, 27). The adjective "religions" is used twice (the Greek words are not the same) (James I, 26; Acts XII, 43). The word "religion" in the New Testament and in Thayer and Westcott, "fear of the Gods", "religious worship especially external, that which consists in ceremonies", Webster's Dictionary defines the word in English: "Religion is subjective, designating the feelings and acts of men which relate to God". And so in the dictionaries generally. Religion is man's thought of God, and his feeling toward God. No doubt Christianity has this side to it but man's thought and feeling toward God are secondary and derivative in it. They follow upon God's thought and feeling toward man. Christianity is not man's search for God but God's search for man, not man's thought Godward but God's thought manward. It is not religion but revelation. This was John's view: "Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins. We love him, because he first loved us." (I John IV, 10, 19) And it was Paul's view. "The grace of God had appeared", "had shown from above and without" (Titus II, 11; III, 4). God had come in Christ. (). This was the Gospel. Man had not found God. God had found man. The Gospel was the self revelation of God (I Cor. II, 10; Eph. III, 3, 5; Rom. XVI, 25; Gal. I, 12; I Peter I, 13; Rev. I. 1). Some modern teachers represent Christianity to be the religion of Christ. i. e. His attitude and experience toward God. But the New Testament view was not that Christianity was the religion of Christ but that Christ was the religion of Christians, or in a word "Christ is Christianity", "Christianity is Christ".

John Macmurray referred to this in a paper prepared for the International Missionary Council in Jerusalem in 1928:

2.

To the early Christians Christ was their religion. Let us try to recover their thought of Him and the place which He filled in their life and experience. As already stated ① -

He was to them "ala in all". (Col. III, 11) - the promised Messiah (John I) the Son of God (), Savior (), Lord (), the Son of Man (), Redemer (), King () wisdom, righteousness, sanctification (I Cor. I, 30) power (I Cor. I, 24) purity (Titus, II, 14) peace (Eph. II, 14) hope (Col. I, 27; I Tim. I, 1) faith (Gal. II, 20). He was the life of the Christian. (Col. III, 4; Phil. I, 21; I Thess. V, 10). All this was not mere metaphor. It was reality. A new quality of life had come into the world and, with whatever failings and short comings, the early Church was the evidence of it - especially in its affectionateness, its purity and its joy. Of its brotherly love we have already spoken. Harnack held that purity was one of the four major notes of its thought and preaching - God as Father and Creator, Jesus as Savior and Redeemer, purity and the Resurrection. The world around was a , unclean world. John writes of its lusts and wickedness (I John II, 17, V, 19) and Paul and Peter of its uncleanness (Rom. I, 24; Gal. V, 19; Eph. IV, 19; II Peter II, 10). Christianity was a blast of protest against all uncleanness. It was not even to be named, so hateful was it. (Eph. V, 3; Jude 23). The very breath of Christianity was purity (I John III, 3; John XV, 3; II Cor. VII, 1; James IV, 8; I John I, 7,9).

And specially was primitive Christianity a thing of gladness. "Joy" was one of its most familiar words.

"These things have I spoken unto you, that my joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full." (John XV, 11) "And the disciples were filled with joy, and with the Holy Ghost." (Acts XIII, 52) "For the kingdom of God is not meat and drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost. Now the God of hope fill you with all joy and peace in believing, that ye may abound in hope, through the power of the Holy Ghost." (Rom. XIV, 17; XV, 13). "But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith." (Gal. V, 22) "Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations. But rejoice, inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that, when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy." (I Peter I, 6; IV, 13) "And these things write we unto you, that you joy may be full." (I John I, 4) "And not only so, but we also joy in God, through our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom we have now received the atonement." (Rom. V, 11).

The early Christians, says Dr. Glover, "were the most essentially happy people of the day--Jesus was their hope, their sufficiency was of God, their names were written in heaven, they were full of love for all men--they had "become little children," as Jesus put it, glad and natural. Jesus had brought them into a new world of possibilities. A conduct that ancient moralists dared not ask, the character of Jesus suggested, and the love of Jesus made actual. "I can do all things," said Paul, "in him that strengtheneth me." They looked to assured victory over evil and they achieved it. "This is the victory that has overcome the world--our faith." Very soon a new note is heard in their words. Stoicism was never "essentially musical"; Epictetus announces a hymn to Zeus, (D.i,16, the hymn he proposes is quoted on p.62. It hardly sings itself, and he does not return to it. The verbal parallel of the passage with that in Clement, Strom. vii,35, heightens the contrast of tone.) but he never starts the tune. Over and over again there is a sound of singing in Paul--as in the eighth chapter of the Romans, and the thirteenth of First Corinthians, (See Norden, Kunstprosa, ii,509.) and it repeats itself. "Children of joy" is Barnabas' name for his friends. (Barnabas, 7,1.) "Doing the will of Christ we shall find rest," wrote the unknown author of "Second Clement." (II. Clem. 6,7.) "Praising we plough; and singing we sail," wrote the greater Clement. (Strom. vii,35.) "Candidates for angelhood, even here we learn the strain here--after to be raised to God, the function of our future glory," said Tertullian. (de orat.3.) "Clâthe thyself in gladness, that always has grace with God and is welcome to him--and revel in it. For every glad man does what is good, and thinks what is good....The holy spirit is a glad spirit... yes, they shall all live to God, who put away sadness from themselves and

4.
'clothe themselves in all gladness.'" So said the angel to ~~Herma~~ Herma, (Herma, M.10,31,--the word is iyapos; which Clement (l.c.) also uses, conjoining it with oeuvos. Cf. Synesius, Ep.57,p.1389, Migne, who says that when he was depressed about becoming a bishop (410 A.D.), old men told him

and he was right. The holy spirit was a glad spirit, and gladness--joy in the holy spirit--was the secret of Christian morality. Nothing could well be more gay and happy than Clement's Protrepticus. Augustine was attracted to the church because he saw it non dissolute hilaris. Such happiness in men is never without a personal centre, and the church made no secret that this centre was "Jesus Christ, whom you have not seen, but you love him; whom yet you see not, but you believe in him and rejoice with joy unspeakable and glorified." (I Peter, 1,8.)

This was the Christianity of the early Church. It bore the marks of the times, just as the Incarnation was God manifested in a particular Person belonging to a particular race and coming into a particular part of the world at a particular time. But the Person was a universal Person and Christianity was a universal Gospel. The Person lives for us today transcendent over the particularities of Palestine.nineteen centuries ago, abiding in His authority over all places and all times. And the Christianity of its origins abides too, by virtue of its inner divine life and power; in its nature, meeting by its inherent truth and vitality the needs of each new age. The outward modes of expression and adeptation alter with the shifting life of man and the world, but we may be sure, to use Canon Streeter's words "that the line of advance for the Church today is not to the but to recapture the spirit of the primitive Church"(Streeter, "The Primitive Church"pg.262).

The Early Church and "Other" Religions.

No aspect of primitive Christianity is of more interest to us today than its attitude to non-Christian religion, both to Judaism, and also to pagan religions so far as this attitude is reflected in the New Testament. Too often our contemporary conception of tolerance is stretched beyond the persons whom we are bound to treat with love and sympathy and brotherliness to the systems and the errors embodied in them for which there is no place for tolerance.

There is a common mood in our day which is the just resignation of common problems and common needs and common human experiences, or glosses over or even denies the radical and fundamental differences between Christianity and all "other religions." The illustrations of this mood lie about us on every hand.

Was this the view of Christianity and other religions held by the early Christians? As we read the New Testament we meet a far different mind. On the very face of it the New Testament is a propaganda of a new, universal and absolute message of the significance of a unique and solitary personality, of "One Name" over all names, and of one salvation. It declares that every man needs it and it alone and it offers itself to every man and claims from every man exclusive supreme loyalty to Jesus Christ and to Him only. This is the representation of the New Testament from the first to the last. Jesus did not appear simply as a Jewish teacher and prophet in line with the great succession, a rabbi come from God on the human level, as Nicodemus was prepared to acknowledge, but as the only Son of God, to be the Judge and Savior of the World. His message was not merely the message of the Old Testament and His Gospel only a new Judaism.

Christianity at the outset did indeed sustain a distinctive and organic relationship to the Old Testament and the Hebrew tradition. It embraced all that was universal in ~~Hebrew~~ religion just as it redeemed and included all that it found that was universal in other religions, but it was historically the outgrowth and successor of Judaism.

Whether this attitude of the New Testament Church toward the non-Christian religions is the right attitude for us today or whether it should be modified in any regard is no question at all for all of us who still hold, as we believe rightly, the version of Christianity in the New Testament and the New Testament interpretation of its implications are true and therefore authoritative because true. We are not considering now the missionary method of the early Church or the problem of missionary ~~expansion~~ today but the prior question of the conviction of the primitive Church as to the nature of Christianity and its relation to other religions.

But it has been and is argued that primitive Christianity, whether the first Christians were conscious of it or not, was, in reality and inevitably so deeply influenced by surrounding religions that it was in truth a syncretism rather than an original and radical branch with its past and its environment and that it was hospitable and syncretistic character that gave it its influence and its survival and in the end its conquering power. And the corollary would follow that Christianity should be of the same character and policy today. We are concerned now only with the Apostolic Church and its view. Was its Christianity distinctive and original or in any measure derivative and syncretistic?

From what sources would primitive Christianity have been derived? The list could not include more than Judaism, Hellenism, the mystery religions and

To any one grasping the real character of early Christianity "its connection with Judaism", to use Harnachs words

The second and third centuries indeed witnessed a great development of Christian thought and organization. Harnack describes this development in "The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries". His first volume ends with an Epilogue on "Christianity in its Completed Form as Syncretistic Religion", but he holds "it revealed to the world a special kind of syncretism, namely, the syncretism of a universal religion. Every force, every relationship in its environment, was mastered by it and made to serve its own ends--a feature in which the other religions in the Roman empire make but a poor, a meagre, and a narrow show. Yet unconsciously it learned and borrowed from many quarters; indeed it would be impossible to imagine it existing amid all the wealth and vigour of these religions, had it not drawn pith and flavour even from them. These religions fertilized the ground for it, and the new grain and seed which fell upon that soil sent down its roots and grew to be a mighty tree. Here is a religion which embraces everything, and yet it can always be expressed in perfectly simple terms: one name, the name of Jesus Christ, still sums up everything." (Pg. 391f)

And Harnack closes his epilogue: "This religion was the first to cut the ground from under the feet of all other religions, and by means of her religious philosophy, as a civilising power, to displace ancient philosophy. (Cp. the question started by Henrici in his *Das Urchristentum* (1902), p. 3.) But the reasons for the triumph of Christianity in that age are no guarantee for the permanence of that triumph throughout the history of mankind. Such a triumph rather depends upon the simple elements of the religion, on the preaching of the living God as the Father of men, and on the likeness of Jesus Christ. For that very reason it depends also on the capacity of Christianity to strip off once more any collective syncretism and unite itself to fresh coefficients. The Reformation made a beginning in this direction." (Pg. 397)

What direction? The direction of a return to the fulness of life and power and the purity and simplicity of faith of Christianity at the beginning.

(Art. "The Mystery of the Early Church" by Eberhard Arnold in "The Plough", March, 1938.)

The inner experience of the early church consisted of the riches of the mystery, "Christ in you," and that in its deepest meaning as the certain expectation of glory. In this the communal spirit of the early church distinguishes itself clearly from the collective soul of world revolution for the sake of the future state. In world revolution the focus is the same, namely, the coming order of social justice and peace between the nations and the all-unifying fellowship of man. In world revolution there is hidden the same holy and divine protest against the spirit of Mammon and Murder as in the proclamation of the kingdom by Jesus and the apostles. In world revolution the same spirit is at work as brought the early church together but it is not yet concentrated into the same awakening experience, it has not yet been able to create absolute, effective unity, unity has not yet been able to take form. For the "Christ in us" has not yet entered our conscious mind, Jesus Christ is not yet recognised everywhere as the embodiment and the unique realisation of the longed-for spirit. The deepest mystery of the early church lies in the presence of Christ himself who makes his abode in the individual and reveals the power of his presence in the midst of his church. That was the proclamation of the all-unifying and unifying spirit of Pentecost—that the crucified one had risen and God had wakened him from the dead and made him Messiah and King of the coming kingdom. It was on hearing this proclaimed that the early church was baptised in the name and into the nature and character of Jesus. Confronted with absolute truth which brought them as murderers of Jesus before the eyes of the living Christ, there arose a need for forgiveness of sins, a need for inward poverty which could only be satisfied through the gift of the Holy Spirit. What we need today is the same Spirit and the same living Christ as the early church experienced. But it is just this that is so seldom to be found amongst Christians—that the clear proclamation of the risen Christ reveals itself as the uniting spirit which awakens in others their original nature and their true vocation. How rare this love of Christ has become, this love which knows and recognises the hearts of others, which knows how to speak their language because it fulfils and experiences their ultimate and deepest longing. It is only in such communal experiences of the Spirit, when that which is said by the speaker meets with a deep response from within, that a true insight into individual and collective sin is given.

The fact that Christ pierced into the hearts of each individual in the common experience of the early church became a reality. He took over from within the sole, decisive leadership in the fellowship of all. As his spirit of love, working outwards, meant experiencing with others their real vocation it gave to the individual freedom from all that which inwardly crushed and cramped him taking the burden completely from his soul. So, in the same way, this spirit, working inwards, showed itself as the actual outcome of unifying love which knows no barriers. That which Jesus said in the Sermon on the Mount and indeed all his words, became here reality. The fellowship in his words was a power which bore testimony to life and formed life because he himself was the life of his words. The brotherly fellowship of being truly bound together became, as the fellowship of prayer and of the breaking of bread, real community, embracing the whole life. Life community means having one's life and one's goods in common. All who had come to this faith remained together and had everything in common, and they sold their possessions and goods and divided them among all according as each had need. (Acts 2.44-45.) After this communal experience of the spirit, which surged up from within, there could be no question here of any prescribed rule or legality but the essence of it all consisted simply in this, that the early church was one heart and one soul. As soon as that becomes more than a term of speech, as soon as it is simple reality, one has everything in common and none can

say of his goods that they are his own. Because the power of the risen Jesus was effective in the early church, there could be no single individual among them in want. Those having land or houses, sold them and brought the money to the church. From the point of view of the penetrating effect of the spirit of love which is as simple as it is thorough, it is of no significance how long it lasted or under what conditions it can be applied in this or some corresponding way, or when this first love must become old and withered. It is also of no significance whether we call this essential fact of the life of the early church, communism, or whether we want to call it something else. The only thing that matters is to comprehend with the heart, with the feeling of love at work within us, that the spirit of Christ, as soon as it takes possession of us, can know no boundaries of possession or property. The only thing that matters is that we see the mystery of the early church is unconditional love which is the nature and character of the risen Christ. There is only one thing that knows no conditions, that is love. There is only one direct contact with reality, that is the experience of the love of God in Christ Jesus. God is love. His love is realised and has become incarnate in Christ.

Eberhard Arnold.

The Early Church and the Race Problem.

It would seem that the race problem as a theoretical issue of the relationship of the various races of mankind was not consciously present to the mind of the early Church. The same thing was true in the case of slavery, war, the relation of Church and State, marriage and divorce, and other issues. Nevertheless, the Gospel contained basic principles determining all these relationships, and these principles, even if not all their practical implications and consequences, were discerned, and by our Lord and Paul and John at least, in the matter of race and race relations, were grasped and declared. And found realization and expression in the local communities of Christian believers, ~~was~~ in Christ. In reality, however, it was not a matter of principles. It was a community of life. Christ was the Saviour and Head of all men and all men were one in their need, one in their nature, one in their inclusion in the love of God and the purpose and offer of Christ. All this we shall find in the record of the beginnings of Christianity.

In dealing with the problem of race and race consciousness and race relations the Gospel grappled with one of the oldest and most difficult of human problems, more acute and tragic today than ever before in human history. When did the consciousness of race and of racial differences first come to men? What evidence of its presence do we find and what forms did it take among the ancient people? Mr. Marvin finds the feeling of race consciousness earliest among the ancient Greeks.

"They were the first," says he, "to distinguish between themselves, the city-founding, freedom-loving, philosophising Hellenes and the other races whom they met with, who did not possess these qualities and uttered a strange and unintelligible speech, and were hence called 'Barbaroi' or stammerers. The Romans, as they came into the same Greek system of city-states and civilised life, were admitted within the pale. We thus gained from the quick-questioning, analytic mind of Greece the first division between Western Races and the World....Side by side with the birth of this consciousness of a superior civilisation comes the first deliberate effort to train up each generation of fresh members of the community in the tradition, the habits, and the meaning of the civilisation which they had inherited." (Western Races in the World, p.20.)

In differentiating themselves from other races the Greeks had in mind aesthetic and moral and intellectual differences. Mr. Bevan gathers various utterances of the Greek race-consciousness. "'In the case of the barbarians all, except one man, are slaves,' says an oft-quoted line in Euripides. The poets, Aristotle observes, speak as if a 'slave' and a 'barbarian' were really the same thing, and he accepts such utterances as stating a serious scientific fact. 'Persons with the natural faculty of command are wanting amongst the barbarians.'" (Western Races and the World, p.50.) "The qualities in virtue of which mankind is superior to the other animals," wrote Plato's contemporary, Isocrates, "are the same qualities in virtue of which the Hellenes, as a race, are superior to the barbarians, that is, they have minds better trained for intelligence and for the expression of thought in words." The Greeks had, therefore, a natural right to rule over barbarians, as Euripides wrote in Iphigenia:

"It is meet

That Greece should over Barbarians bear sway,

Not that Barbarians lord it over Greece;

Nature hath formed them slaves, the Grecians free."

[As a matter of fact in the fourth century B.C. there were more Greeks ruled by Persians than there were barbarian subjects of Greece, but Isocrates was already preaching the doctrine of the duty of Greece to conquer Asia, not to establish any selfish despotism but to extend the blessings of a rational rule conceived in terms of guardianship over weaker peoples. Aristotle counselled Alexander in his conquests to keep the status of Greek and Asiatic quite distinct, but Alexander, says Mr. Bevan, "adopted a policy definitely contrary to this advise. Whatever his ideas may have been when he first invaded Asia, by the time that he was secure in the seat of the Great King, he formed the design of a fusion between East and West. His idea was apparently to initiate a systematic mixing of races--a mode of uni-

ifying the inhabitants of his Empire in one Eurasian Amalgam....It does not, of course, follow from Alexander's desire to merge the Greeks in a racial amalgam that he wished their culture to be similarly merged in a nondescript syncretism. It is conceivable that while he wanted the races mixed, he wished Hellenism as a culture to be predominant. The indications rather point to this being in his mind. The cities of Greek type which he founded all over the empire were to be nurseries of Hellenic life. In a tract attributed to Plutarch and written at any rate many centuries after Alexander, he is lauded as the belligerent missionary of a higher culture in the backward East....We must beware of confounding this cultural pride of the Greeks with racial intolerance. The Greeks thought poorly of barbarian culture, but, provided a barbarian took on the Hellenistic character, they do not seem to have subjected him to any social exclusion on account of his blood. There is an interesting protest recorded on the part of the great Alexandrine geographer Eratosthenes (born 276 B.C.) against the racial intolerance involved in Aristotle's advice to Alexander as to his attitude to Greeks and barbarians respectively. The division between men, he said, should not go by race but by moral character; there were many undesirable sorts of Greeks and many civilised kinds of barbarians, such as the Indians and Persians. Just so in the Plutarchian tract referred to above it is said that the distinction of Hellene and barbarian was not to be taken as depending on race or on fashion of dress, but upon virtue and vice. There is, even so, a noteworthy assumption implicit in this identification of virtue with Hellenism.

"The educated class all over Asia Minor, Mesopotamia, Syria and Egypt during the centuries succeeding Alexander became 'Greeks.' There can have been no very clear line of demarcation between the Greeks of barbarian origin and the Greeks of Hellenic blood." (Western Races and the World, pp.57-60).

The Roman consciousness of race began with a sense of Rome's indebtedness to the Greek race. The discerning Romans realised that they had been themselves among the barbarians and in joke, at least, they applied the word to their native culture and even spoke of their own language as "a barbarous tongue." Cicero writes to his brother who was Roman Governor of Asia in 60 B.C., ruling over Greeks:

"Seeing that we are set over a race of men who not only possess the higher culture, but are held to be the source from which it has spread to others, we are above all things bound to repay to them that which we have received at their hands. For I am not ashamed to confess--the more so, since my life and achievements have been such as to place me above all suspicion of laziness and frivolity--that whatever I have accomplished has been attained by the principles and methods handed down to us by Greek teachers and their works. And so, beside the general good faith which we owe to all men, we are, I think, under a special obligation to that race." (Western Races and the World, p.71.)

This racial respect for the Greeks was perhaps a mark of the more intelligent and rational feeling. Among the mass of the people and with the politicians who manipulated them the orthodox view was contempt for the Greeks. Cicero speaks of Crassus as seeking influence by affecting to despise the Greeks and of Antonius doing so by affecting ignorance of their culture. As the Roman conquests grew under Julius Caesar it is clear that he cherished the idea of a cosmopolitan world state. [He gave Roman citizenship indiscriminately to men of many races, but died with his full plans undeveloped. He took Africans and Asiatics to Gaul. What happened in the world war in France had happened two thousand years before. By the time of Augustus it had become clear that Rome must find some solution of the problem of relation to her subject races of varying degrees of culture. He did not repeat Caesar's experiment of introducing Gauls into the Roman Senate which had offended Roman prejudice. He checked the infiltration of alien blood into the citizen stock and reimposed slavery restrictions which had been relaxed by Caesar. "Under his rule, moreover, and that of his immediate successors, service in the legions, implying the full Roman citizenship (which was conferred upon those not already poss-

essed thereof on enlistment) was in the main confined to Italians, or to members of the extra-Italian communities of Roman right, which were not as yet numerous;... But on the other hand Augustus was firm in his grasp of the sound principle that service should form the pathway to citizenship. This was shown by his reorganisation of the 'auxiliary' regiments, formed by levies of unenfranchised provincials.... It is likely enough that those who served with distinction in the irregular corps passed into one or another branch of the regular army, and so were absorbed into the ruling race." (Ibid., Chapter by H. Stuart Jones on "The Roman Empire," pp.78,83.)

[The deliberate policy of the Roman Empire was unity by Romanisation. A system of municipal institutions was created which reconciled the unity of the State with a measure of local freedom and promoted "the rise of the more backward races of the Empire to a higher plane of civilisation" in accordance with "a cardinal principle of Rome's policy to establish an ordered graduation of status and privilege by which her subjects might climb to an equality with the ruling race." (Ibid., p.93.) Little by little the successors of Augustus "substituted fresh bonds of union for the older cohesive forces of race and tribe" and "built up like some coral island of the Southern Seas a new Graeco-Roman nationality."]

Rome worked with a far clearer and surer recognition of the principle of human unity than characterised Greek thought. Aristotelian theory had declared the inequality of human nature. Cicero asserted its identity and equality. "There is no resemblance," he says, "in nature so great as that between man and man, there is no equality so complete, there is only one possible definition of mankind, for reason is common to all. Men differ indeed in learning, but are equal in the capacity for learning, there is no race which under the guidance of reason cannot attain to virtue." (Ibid., Chap. by A.J. Carlyle on "The Influence of Christianity," p.111.) Roman law and modern civilisation rested upon this ideal. Ulpian lays down the broad general principle that men are by the natural law equal and free. Florentinus treats slavery as an institution of the "jus gentium," which is contrary to nature. Tryphoninus says that liberty belongs to the natural law. (Ibid., p.112.)

And it was not Rome's theory and practice of human unity which led to her downfall. Her welcome to the new races brought her far more than they received from her. She lived on through them. It was not they which destroyed her. "The cause of decay," Mr. Stuart Jones holds, "lay deeper. The failure was a failure to solve the fundamental problem (with which we are still wrestling) of the relation of the individual to the State, especially the Great State." (Ibid., p.106.) The truth of human unity will destroy only those institutions which are built on false ideas of society and politics. And indeed it is the falsehood of these ideas and not the truth of human unity which is the destructive force.

Here and there in the New Testament there are references to these race feelings of Romans and Greeks, to racial prejudices and to the absorption of Jewish elements into Roman citizenship. (Acts XVI; XVIII, 2; Col. III, 11.) We shall consider later the teaching of Christianity and the New Testament with regard to race. But we must turn here to the facts as to race feeling among the Hebrews in the centuries before the Romans and Greeks. It is significant to note that the word "race" is not found in the King James version except in the sense of a running contest. What does this mean? It would seem to mean that the conception of race was not a living conception at the time the King James version was made. The ancient racial problems had been solved or had dropped out of sight. The modern ones had not arisen. Hebrew and Greek words accordingly which we would now translate "race" were rendered "people," "nation," "heathen," "Gentiles." The Hebrews and the Old Testament used three main words which in our modern conception mean "race." In Anglicised forms these words were am, goi, and leon. The first word is from the root "to collect" or "gather together," hence, a people. It is used of single races or tribes, (Judges V, 18.) of the tribes of Israel, (Gen. XLIX, 10.) of a man's race or family, (Lev. XXI, 1, 4,) of the citizens as opposed to rulers, (I Kings XII, 16.) of the whole human race. (Isa. XL, 7.) The second word means a "confluence" or "flow of men." It is used of the Hebrew nation,

"body of men." It is used of the Hebrew nation, (Isa. I, 4.) but in the plural especially of the other nations besides Israel, (Neh. V, 8.) often with the added notion of their being foes or barbarians, (Psa, II, 1, 8; IX, 6, 16, 20, 21; X, 16; LIX, 6, 9.) or of being strangers to the true religion. (Jer. XXXI, 10; Ezek. XXIII, 30; XXX, 11; Psa. CXXXV, 15.) The third word is from an unused root meaning "to agree," perhaps "to gather together." It is much less used than the two other words. It is found in Gen. XXV, 23; XXVII, 29; Psa. VII, 8; Prov. XXIV, 24; Isa. XVII, 12. Daniel uses a distinctive word of his own for nation, "umwah." (Dan. III, 4, 7, 29; IV, 1; V, 19; VI, 25; VII, 14.) There are no clear distinctions in Hebrew thought or language between race and nation. The Hebrews spoke of themselves as many nations and as many races, whereas they were, from our way of thinking, only one race and one nation. And they spoke of the peoples who were not Hebrews as peoples, or nations or races indiscriminately, and Daniel speaks of languages in the same order, "All peoples, nations and languages."

The education of the Hebrews was an education in the sense of race distinction and racial mission. It was begun distinctly as a process of racial and national differentiation, (Gen. XII, 1-3.) and throughout the whole history of the Old Testament writers make the purpose and meaning of the story as they understood it, perfectly clear. In Egypt and then in Canaan they were disciplined to a sense of segregated national and racial personality. The conquest of the Promised Land was left incomplete as part of this training. (Judges II, 21-III, 4.) And the long tragic story of the nation's alternating prosperity and suffering is one of the most instructive chapters in the history of the race problem, with unequalled light on its significance and solution.

Under this education the ancient Hebrews acquired the sense of race distinction in a unique measure. The phrase, "The Chosen People," which we apply to them, does not occur in the Old Testament, but the word "Chosen" is used a few times and the idea, of course, was a dominant idea in the consciousness of Israel. The question which concerns us, however, is as to Israel's attitude to other races. A careful reading of the Old Testament does not support the view that the Hebrews held a narrow race view or disbelieved in the solidarity of humanity. Abraham's call was a call not to isolated racial privilege but to racial training for universal human service. Other races were conceded to have their own culture and worship. The Hebrews were warned against what was unworthy in these, (Deut. XII, 30, 31) and their insufficiency was openly declared. (~~II Kings XVII, 33; XIX, 12; II Chron. XXXII, 15, 17, 23; Isa. XXXVI, 18; XXXVII, 12; Jer. II, 11.~~) Adverse and hostile racial judgments occur, (Micah V, 15; II Chron. XXVIII, 3; XXXIII, 9.) but these are mild in comparison with the racial provocation which the moral condition of ancient culture afforded. And if we will compare the revised version of the Old Testament with the King James Version and will note the scores of passages where the Revised Version substitutes "nations" for "heathen" in the translation we will be surprised to see how much of the supposed warrant for the idea of Old Testament race prejudice fades away. There are, to be sure, harsh racial notes in some of the old characters and incidents, but the Spirit of God which was seeking to make the Jews pure and faithful was seeking also to make them just and brotherly, and was succeeding. They learned to speak in friendly terms of the other races. (Psa. CII, 15; Zech. IX, 10; Ezek. XXXVIII, 23; XXXIX, 27; Mal. I, 11.) They conceived Jehovah as the ruler of other nations as well as their own. (Isa. XLV, 5; Jer. XXVII, 7, 8; Joel III, 12.) God purposed to fulfill the "desire of all nations," (Hag. II, 7.) and peace was to be the law of the life of all peoples. (Micah IV, 3.)
(~~Race and Race Relations - pp. 45-52~~)

And provision was made for the admission of outsiders in the "proselytes of the gate." "The Hebrew alone of ancient people", says Westcott, "in this respect true children of Abraham though in others the most exclusive of all, provided from the first for the admission of strangers to a full share in their most sacred privileges. (Westcott "Social Aspects of Christianity" - Pg. 52).

If some Hebrews forgot all this and thought of themselves as the one superior race destined to rule the world and of the other races as "lesser breeds without the law," they did only what some men in other races have done ever since down until today, and what more men are doing now, probably, than ever before. (~~Race and Race Relations - Pg. 52~~)

For an account of racial contacts and conflicts in Palestine prior to our Lord's coming one may turn to Josephus or to Streane's "Age of the Maccabees". Our special concern is with the racial question as it was met by Jesus. The ~~rest~~ ^{part} of Jesus' life fell within the government of ^{Judea} by the seven Roman procurators, A. D. 6-41. Jesus' public life and teaching fell under the ^{procuratorship} of Pontius Pilate, A. D. 26-36. "So far as the civil enactments and the orders of the supreme authorities were concerned," ~~Schurer~~ ^{Schurer} holds, "the Jews could not complain of any want of consideration being paid them. It was otherwise, however, with respect to the practical carrying out of details. The average Roman official was always disposed to disregard all such nice, delicate consideration. And the unfortunate thing was, that Judea, especially in the last decades before the war, had had more than one governor who had lost all sense of right and wrong. Besides this, notwithstanding the most painstaking efforts to show indulgence to Jewish views and feelings, the existing relations were in themselves, according to Jewish ideas, an insult to all the lofty, divine privileges of the chosen people, who, instead of paying tribute to Caesar, were called rather to rule over all nations of the world. (~~This was, at least, the popular sentiment. From these religious premises in themselves one might, indeed, arrive at the very opposite result, namely, that even the pagan government was of God, and that it must be submitted to so long as God wills. But this way of considering the subject was not in favour during the period A. D. 6-66, and, as the years went on, those who held it were in an ever-decreasing minority. Compare generally on the political attitude of Pharisaism, Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 17-19.~~)" (~~Schurer's~~ ^{Schurer's} "The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ" - Div. I, Vol. II - pg. 79)

And the ~~deeds~~ ^{deeds} of the ~~procurators~~ ^{procurators}, with the history of the past, ~~felt~~ ^{fed} this deep resentment. Jesus met, accordingly, a ~~combination~~ ^{combination} of nationalistic and racial attitudes among His own people. The Pharisees were not primarily a political party. "In politics", says Schurer, "the standpoint of the Pharisees was the genuinely Jewish one of 'looking at political questions not from a political, but from a religious point of view. The Pharisees were by no means a 'political' party, at least not directly. Their aim, viz. the strict carrying out of the law, was not political, but religious. So far as no obstruction was cast in the way of this, they could be content with any government. It was only when the secular power prevented the practice of the law in that strict manner which the Pharisees demanded, that they gathered together to oppose it, and then really became in a certain sense a political party, opposing even external resistance to external force. ~~This took place not only at the time of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes, but also under the Jewish princes John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, who opposed Pharisaic ordinances from their Sadducaean standpoint. On the other hand, the Pharisees had, under Alexander, who left the whole power in their hands, a leading position in the government, which however they used only for the carrying out of their religious demands. To politics as such they were always comparatively indifferent. It must however be admitted, that there were two different religious points of view, especially at the time when Israel was under heathen government or under government friendly to the heathen, from which to judge of the political situation, and that according as the one or the other was placed in the foreground, an opposite demeanour would be maintained towards it. The idea of the Divine Providence might be made the starting-point. Thence would result the thought, that the sway of the heathen over Israel was the will of God, that it was He who had given to the Gentiles power over His people to punish them for their transgressions, that this government of the Gentiles could last only so long as it was the will of God. Hence first of all this chastisement of God must be willingly submitted to: a heathen~~

and moreover a harsh government must be willingly borne, if only the observance of the law was not thereby prevented. From this standpoint the Pharisees Polio and Sameas, e.g., exhorted their fellow-citizens to submit to the rule of Herod. (Antt. xiv. 9, 4, xv. 1.1.) In the time also of the great insurrection against the Romans, we see the chief Pharisees, like Simon the son of Gamaliel, at the head of that mediatizing party, who only joined in the insurrection because they were forced to do so, while they were in heart opposed to it. (Com. on Simon, Bell. Jud. iv. 3.9.) An entirely different result however was arrived at, when the thought of Israel's election was placed in the foreground. Then the rule of the heathen over the people of God would appear as an abnormality whose abolition was by all means to be striven for. Israel must acknowledge no other king than God alone, and the ruler of the house of David, whom He anointed. The supremacy of the heathen was illegal and presumptuous. From this standpoint it was questionable, not merely whether obedience and payment of tribute to a heathen power was a duty, but whether it was lawful (Matt. xxii. 17 sqq.; Mark xii. 14 sqq.; Luke xx. 22sq.). From this standpoint, as it seems, the majority of the Pharisees refused to take the oath to Herod. (Antt. xv. 10. 4, xvii. 24.) It may be supposed that this was the specially popular standpoint, both with the people and the Pharisees. Indeed it must have been such, since every non-Pharisaic government, even when it did not prevent the practice of the law, involved a certain compromise of its free exercise. Hence it was a Pharisee, one Saddukos, who in conjunction with Judas of Galilee founded the revolutionary party of the Zealots. (Antt. xviii. 41; comp. 1. 6.) Indifferent then as Pharisaism at first was to politics, the revolutionary current, which in the time of Christ was continually increasing among the Jewish people, must be set to the account of its influence." (Schuerer's "Div. II, Vol. II - pg. 17-19). *Thid.*

The Pharisees avoided all contact with a heathen as defiling and carried their exclusiveness even into relations within the Jewish race. They "found fault with the free intercourse of Jesus with 'publicans and sinners' and with his entering into their houses (Mark II, 14-17; Matt. IX, 9-13; Luke V, 27-32)...." This exclusiveness of Pharisaism certainly justifies the calling it an aipeia, a sect, as is done both in the New Test. (Acts xv. 5, xxvi. 5) and by Josephus. Nevertheless it remains the fact, that it was the legitimate and classic representative of post-exilic Judaism in general. It did but carry out with relentless energy the consequences of its principle. Those only are the true Israel who observe the law in the strictest manner. Since only the Pharisees did this in the full sense, they only were the true Israel, which was related to the remaining bulk of the people as these were to the heathen." (Schuerer's Div. II, Vol. II, Pg. 25)

The Sadducees were the worldly aristocracy of Israel, politically ambitious and adaptive, "cosmopolitan, quite ready to affiliate with the Gentile, if place or power or wrath could be obtained by so doing" (Abbat, "Dictionary of Religious Knowledge" - pg. 835). The Herodians were "for the most part Sadducees in religious sentiment", adherents of the family of Herod, a political rather than a religious party, anti-Roman at heart but ~~with~~ *still more* anti-Jesus. Jesus denounced this pretended loyalty to Rome as hypocrisy (Matt. XXII, 15-22.) *bitter*

The Zealots were the extreme political group ~~born~~ *born* in anti-racial, anti-national feeling against Rome. Throughout Jesus's ministry they were ^(177, 2) nursing the fires of revolution. (Schuerer, Div. II, Vol. I, pg. 80)

These were the party names and divisions. The broad social background and the deep race prejudice which lay behind are described in dark colors by Edersheim: "To begin with every Gentile child, so soon as born, was to be regarded as unclean. Those who actually worshipped mountains, hills, bushes, &c.--in short, gross idolaters--should be cut down with the sword. But as it was impossible to exterminate heathenism, Rabbinic legislation kept certain definite objects in view, which may be thus summarised: To prevent Jews from being inadvertently led into idolatry; to avoid all participation in idolatry; not to do anything which might aid the heathen in their worship; and, beyond all this, not to give pleasure, nor even help, to heathens. The latter involved a most dangerous principle, capable of

almost indefinite application by fanaticism. Even the Mishnah goes so far (~~Ab. Z. 11. 1~~) as to forbid aid to a mother in the hour of her need, or nourishment to her babe, in order not to bring up a child for idolatry! (~~The Talmud declares it only lawful, if done to avoid exciting hatred against the Jews.~~) But this is not all. Heathens were, indeed, not to be precipitated into danger, but yet not to be delivered from it. Indeed, an isolated teacher ventures even upon this statement: 'The best among the Gentiles, kill; the best among serpents, crush its head.' (~~Meehilta, ed. Weiss, p. 53 b, line 8 from top~~) Still more terrible was the fanaticism which directed that heretics, traitors, and those who had left the Jewish faith should be thrown into actual danger, and, if they were in it, all means for their escape removed. No intercourse of any kind was to be had with such--not even to invoke their medical aid in case of danger to life, (There is a well-known story told of a Rabbi who was bitten by a serpent and about to be cured by the invocation of the name of Jesus by a Jewish Christian, which was, however, interdicted.) since it was deemed, that he who had to do with heretics was in imminent peril of becoming one himself, (~~Yet, such is the moral obliquity, that even idolatry is allowed to save life, provided it be done in secret!~~) and that, if a heretic returned to the true faith, he should die at once--partly, probably, to expiate his guilt, and partly from fear of relapse. Terrible as all this sounds, it was probably not worse than the fanaticism displayed in what are called more enlightened times. Impartial history must chronicle it, however painful, to show the circumstances in which teaching so far different was propounded by Christ. (~~Against this, although somewhat doubtfully, such concessions may be put as that, outside Palestine, Gentiles were not to be considered as idolaters, but as observing the customs of their fathers (Chull. 13b), and that the poor of the Gentiles were to be equally supported with those of Israel, their sick visited, and their dead buried; it being, however, significantly added, 'on account of the arrangements of the world' (Gitt. 61a). The quotation so often made (Ab. Z. 3a), that a Gentile who occupied himself with the Torah was to be regarded as equal to the High-Priest, proves nothing, since in the case supposed the Gentile acts like a Rabbinic Jew. But, and this is a more serious point, it is difficult to believe that those who make this quotation are not aware, how the Talmud (Ab. Z. 3a) immediately labours to prove that their reward is not equal to that of Israelites. A somewhat similar charge of one-sidedness, if not of unfairness, must be brought against Deutsch (~~Lecture on the Talmud, Remains, pp. 146, 147~~), whose sketch of Judaism should be compared, for example, with the first Perek of the Talmudic tractate Abodah Sarah.~~)

"In truth, the bitter hatred which the Jew bore to the Gentile can only be explained from the estimate entertained of his character. The Most vile, and even unnatural, crimes were imputed to them. It was not safe to leave battle in their charge, to allow their women to nurse infants, or their physicians to attend the sick, nor to walk in their company, without taking precautions against sudden and unprovoked attacks. They should, so far as possible, be altogether avoided, except in cases of necessity or for the sake of business. They and theirs were defiled; their houses unclean, as containing idols or things dedicated to them; their feasts, their joyous occasions, their very contact, was polluted by idolatry; and there was no security, if a heathen were left alone in a room, that he might not, in wantonness or by carelessness, defile the wine or meat on the table, or the oil and wheat in the store. Under such circumstances, therefore, everything must be regarded as having been rendered unclean. Three days before a heathen festival (according to some, also three days after) every business transaction with them was prohibited, for fear of giving either help or pleasure. Jews were to avoid passing through a city where there was an idolatrous feast--nay, they were not even to sit down within the shadow of a tree dedicated to idol-worship. Its wood was polluted; if used in baking the bread was unclean; if a shuttle had been made of it, not only was all cloth woven on it forbidden, but if such had been inadvertently mixed with other pieces of cloth, or a garment made from it placed with other garments, the whole became unclean. Jewish workmen were not to assist in building basilicas, nor stadia, nor places where judicial sentences were

pronounced by the heathen. Of course, it was not lawful to let houses or fields, nor to sell cattle to them. Milk drawn by a heathen, if a Jew had not been present to watch it, (Ab.Zar.35b) bread and oil prepared by them, were unlawful. Their wine was wholly interdicted (~~According to R. Asi, there was a threefold distinction. If wine had been dedicated to an idol, to carry, even on a stick, so much as the weight of an olive of it, defiled a man. Other wine, if prepared by a heathen, was prohibited, whether for personal use or for trading. Lastly, wine prepared by a Jew, but deposited in custody of a Gentile, was prohibited for personal use, but allowed for traffic.~~)--the mere touch of a heathen polluted a whole cask; nay, even to put one's nose to heathen wine was strictly prohibited!

"Painful as these details are, they might be multiplied. And yet the bigotry of these Rabbis was, perhaps, not worse than that of other sectaries. It was a painful logical necessity of their system, against which their heart, no doubt, often rebelled; and, it must be truthfully added, it was in measure accounted for by the terrible history of Israel." ~~Edersheim~~ (Edersheim "The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah"-pp. 90-92).

What was Jesus' attitude toward this Jewish racialism and its anti-Roman, anti-Gentile animus? He welcomed a cousin, who belonged to the Zealot party as one of His twelve apostles (Luke V, 5.) He praised Nathanael as a true Israelite (John I, 47). He declared that His mission was primarily to the lost sheep of the house of Israel (Matt. XV, 24.). He told the women of Samaria that salvation was of the Jews. (John IV, 22). He felt the deepest love for Jerusalem. (Matt. XXIII, 37; Luke XIX, 41-44). He knew that He was the promised Messiah, (John IV, 25) and He began His work and laid the foundation of His Kingdom and died within His own Jewish race and nation. He was mocked as "The King of Israel". (Matt. XXVII, 42). And over His Cross Pilate set the declaration of His nationality and race: "This is the King of the Jews" (Luke XXIII, 38). But it was written in three languages, the languages of the three races of the Roman world! (John XIX, 20).

Standing within the Jewish race and nationality, however, Jesus refused to countenance or employ any party feeling or racial or political prejudice. He joined no Jewish faction and His words of condemnation fell on Pharisee and Sadducee alike. (Matt. XXIII, 13-29; XVI, 6; XIX, 6-12). He met with the greatest skill and temperance of mind the clever artifices of His enemies to entangle Him in racial and political animosities. (Mark XII, 13-40). He stood in Israel but He also stood above Israel. (Matt. VIII, 10; John III, 10; Luke IV, 25, 27). He discouraged the premature proclamation of His Messiahship because He knew it would be misconstrued and misrepresented in the interest of racial nationalism (Luke IV, 41; Matt. IX, 30; XII, 16.).

When a Roman captain came to ask Him for help in behalf of his sick servant Jesus responded at once and used the incident of the man's faith (Matt. V, 5-13) "to drive home the much-needed lesson that the Jews were likely to be found fatally lacking in just those qualities of soul and character which are essential for the membership of God's kingdom; whereas many who belonged to the despised gentile races would be found truly fitted for that kingdom." (Hoyland's "The Teaching of Jesus on Human Relations" - Pg. 92).

On only one occasion did Jesus go beyond the bounds of Palestine into a foreign country. The story of that visit to Phenicea is told in Matt. XV, 21-28 and Mark VII, 24-30. Here a woman of a different race asked his help and, after being tested for her sincerity and humility, received what she asked. "The narrative", remarks Canon Cook ("Bible Commentary", Mark VII, 30) "marks a great crisis in the training of the disciples. It was the first clear indication (But see Luke IV, 25-27) of the line which they were themselves to follow in dealing with the heathen, and it foreshadowed the different characteristics of leading parties in the early Church". †

The broad fact is that Christianity came into the world in Christ bearing the stamp of universality. One of His earliest sermons gave great offense because He laid emphasis on the outreaching grace of God. Elijah, He pointed out, had been sent to none of the widows of Israel in the days of famine, but to a Sidonian woman, and Elisha had cleansed no lepers of Israel

but only Naaman, the Syrian. "And they were all filled with wrath as they heard these things." (Luke IV: 25-29.) The same spirit of nationalistic narrowness, from which Jesus was free, found expression in the sneer of the Jews at Jesus' declaration, "Ye shall seek Me and shall not find Me; and where I am, ye cannot come. The Jews therefore said among themselves, Whither will this man go that we shall not find Him? Will He go unto the Dispersion among the Greeks, and teach the Greeks?" (John VII: 34, 35) As though in contrast with this smallness of vision, John proceeds to relate the words of Jesus on the last, the great day of the Feast of Tabernacles, beginning, "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me and drink." (John VII: 37.)

This contrast between the attitude of Jesus and the attitude of the ~~Jews~~ Jews is sharply presented in their relations to the Samaritans. The Jews had no dealings with the Samaritans, (John IV: 9.) But Jesus ignored and violated these restraints. "He went and entered into a village of the Samaritans." (Luke IX: 52.) He sent His disciples into a Samaritan village to buy food and welcomed the people of the village to faith and discipleship. (John IV: 39-42.) And He deliberately gave to a Samaritan a place in one of His most exquisite parables above Levite and priest. (Luke X: 33.)

It was significant that the first people to recognise the universal mission of Jesus were Samaritans. "We know that this is indeed the Saviour of the world," they said. (John IV: 42.) Yet in some sense, this sweep of the work of Jesus had been already perceived. The song of the angels suggested it. (Luke II: 10, 14.) Aged Simeon foresaw it. "Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation," he said, as the child Jesus lay in his arms,

"Which thou hast prepared before the face of all peoples,
A light for revelation to the Gentiles." (Luke II: 31, 32.)

And John the Baptist hinted at it also: "The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world." (John I: 29.) Thenceforward it was revealed with increasing clearness that Jesus was in the world for the world. He said, Himself, that the field was the world. (Matt. XIII: 38.) His disciples were the light of the world, (Matt. V: 14.) as He had come a light into the world (John XII: 36.) and was Himself the world's light. (John VIII: 12.) He called Himself the bread of God which had come down for the life of the world. (John VI: 33, 35.)

Indeed, throughout, Jesus would admit ^{for Himself} no narrower field of work and salvation ~~for Himself~~ than the world. There are apparently contradictory statements. "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." (Matt. XV: 24.) "Go not into any way of the Gentiles and enter not into any city of the Samaritans." (Matt. X: 5.) Jesus had to make a beginning. His immediate mission was to Israel. The only way in which any larger mission could be made possible was by the discharge of this mission to the Jews. A salvation for all was to be wrought out in time and space and until the work was done the field was confined. But beyond all the immediate and preparatory work lay the universal reaches of a redemption for all mankind. Jesus was such a good Israelite in order that the mission of Israel might be fulfilled and there be henceforth neither Jew nor Greek. Accordingly the whole spirit and message of Jesus were universal. "God sent not His son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved." (John III: 16, 17.) He contemplated the conviction of the world, (John XVI: 8; XVII: 21, 23.) and the preaching of His gospel among all nations. (Matt. XII: 14; XXVI: 13.) And even before His coming, He said, the Father had intended the temple to be a place of prayer for all nations, (Matt. XI: 17.) while ~~yet~~ all local limits were set aside and everywhere true worshippers were invited to come immediately to the Father without temple and without priest. (John IV: 20-24.)

Jesus told of a good Father over all, (Matt. V: 45-48.) of a light in Himself adequate for all guidance, (John VIII: 12.) of Himself as the only way to the Father, (John XIV: 6.) and as the truth and the life. (John XIV: 6.) In view of all this the nation in which He was could be the starting point only, not the goal. His gospel was a message for all men everywhere. (~~Race and Race Relations. - Pgs. 246-248.~~)

In one form or another each of the four Gospels at its close cites words of Jesus which contemplated the whole world and all of humanity as the field of His church, and the Book of Acts opens with the same note. (~~Matt. XXVIII, 19; Mark XVI, 15; Luke XXIV, 47; John XVII, 21; Acts I, 8~~). And perhaps it is even more significant that this universality was the calm assumption of His thought (~~Matt. XXVI, 13~~).

There are some who find the heart of Jesus' teaching and of Christianity in the great ideas of the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of Man, and there are others who deny that God is the Father of all men or that there is any natural human brotherhood. The truth as we conceive it, is that the Fatherhood of God and the Brotherhood of man are not the Gospel but are in the Gospel, ~~the Gospel is Jesus Christ as the revelation of the Father and as the Head of Humanity; that God is the Father of all man but that this sonship is unrecognized and is also far transcended by our sonship through Christ (John I, 12; Rom. IV, 11; VIII, 15; II Cor. VII, 18; Gal. IV, 6; Eph. II, 18; I John II, 23), that men are brothers but that the true brotherhood is in relationship to Christ, the Elder Brother. But the two ideas, whether conceived in a thin humanism or in the rich significance of the Gospel are ideas originating with Jesus and they were, with Him and are in history, fatal to racial prejudice.~~

When we turn from the Gospels to the Book of Acts we come upon the drama of the unfolding universality of Christianity. (~~Acts I: 8; II: 5-11, 39; III: 25; IV: 12, 24; VI: 1, 9; VIII: 5, 27; IX: 15; X: 28, 34f., 43; XI: 12, 17, etc.~~) The Tübingen school of critics rewrote the history in terms of a feud between Paul and Peter, as representing the two attitudes to the race problem with which we are confronted today, the attitude of human equality and the attitude of Nordic race aristocracy. There was no such feud, but there was a real struggle in Paul's own mind and in Peter's (~~Acts X.~~) as to the right solution of the race issue and the real necessity of a living acceptance of the new and revolutionary doctrines of "the brethren who are of the races" (~~Acts XV: 23,~~) and of the organic unity of mankind. To see how vivid the teaching of Christianity was, open the New Testament and read it again, substituting the word "races" for "Gentiles". (~~Cf. Matt. XII: 21; Mark X: 42; Acts IX: 15; X: 45; XI: 18; XIV: 27; XXVIII: 28; Rom. I: 13; III: 29; XI: 25; XV: 11f., 16; Eph. III: 6; I Thess. II: 16; I Tim. II: 7; I Peter II: 12.~~) And read anew its references to Greeks and barbarians. (~~John XII: 20; Acts XIV: 1; XV: 4; XIX: 10; XX: 21; Rom. I: 14; X: 12; I Cor. I: 24.~~) And note the great utterances of Paul in Gal. III: 28; Col. III: 11, and Eph. II: 22.

"There can be neither Jew nor Greek, there can be neither bond nor free, there can be no male and female; for ye are all one man in Christ Jesus." (~~Gal. III: 28.~~)

"Where there cannot be Greek and Jew, circumcision and uncircumcision, barbarian, Scythian, bondman, freeman; but Christ is all, and in all." (~~Col. III: 11.~~)

"Wherefore remember, that once ye, the Gentiles in the flesh, who are called uncircumcision by that which is called circumcision, in the flesh, made by hands; that ye were at that time separate from Christ, alienated from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of the promise, having no hope and without God in the world. But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ. For He is our peace, who made both one, and brake down the middle wall of partition, having abolished in His flesh the enmity, even the law of commandments contained in ordinances; that He might create in himself of the two one new man, so making peace; and might reconcile them both in one body unto God through the cross, having slain the enmity thereby; and He came and preached peace to you that were far off, and peace to them that were nigh: forthrough him we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father. So then ye are no more strangers and sojourners, but ye are fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God, being built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Christ Jesus himself bring the chief corner stone; in whom each several building, fitly framed together, groweth into

to a holy temple in the Lord; in whom ye also are builded together for a habitation of God in the Spirit." (Eph. II:11-22.)

Of all the foolish words spoken today none are more foolish than those spoken in depreciation of Paul. The idea that he narrowed the gospel and shadowed its freedom and joy is as wide of the truth as any idea men ever conceived. It was the truth of God which was given to him to speak which saved the Roman Empire from dissolution for a thousand years and which is yet to save and unify mankind. A fine passage of Sir William Ramsay's describes the first of these two services:

"In the mind of the ancients no union of men, small or great, good or bad, humble or honourable, was conceivable without a religious bond to hold it together. The Roman Empire, if it was to become an organic unity, must derive its vitality and its hold on men's minds from some religious bond. Patriotism, to the ancients, was adherence to a common religion, just as the family ~~relationship~~ ~~(from the adopted son tie was, not common blood, but~~ communion in the family religion (for the adopted son was as real a member as the son by nature). Accordingly, when Augustus essayed the great task of consolidating the loosely aggregated parts of the vast Empire, he had to find a religion to consecrate the unity by a common idea and sentiment. The existing religions were all national, while the Empire (as we saw) was striving to extirpate the national divisions and create a supra-national unity. A new religion was needed. Partly with conscious intention, partly borne unconsciously on the tide of events, the young Empire created the Imperial religion, the worship of an idea--the cult of the Majesty of Rome, as represented by the incarnate deity present on earth in the person of the reigning Emperor, and by the dead gods, his deified predecessors on the throne. Except for the slavish adulation of the living Emperor, the idea was not devoid of nobility; but it was incapable of life, for it degraded human nature, and was founded on a lie. But Paul gave the Empire a more serviceable idea. He made possible that unity at which the imperial policy was aiming. The true path of the Empire lay in allowing free play to the idea which Paul offered, and strengthening itself through this unifying religion. That principle of perfect religious freedom (which we regard as Seneca's) directed for a time the imperial policy, and caused the acquittal of Paul on his first trial in Rome. But freedom was soon exchanged for the policy of fire and sword. The imperial gods would not give place to a more real religion, and fought for two and a half centuries to maintain their sham worship against it. When at last, the idea of Paul was, even reluctantly and imperfectly, accepted by the Emperors, no longer claiming to be gods, it gave new life to the rapidly perishing organisation of the Empire and conquered the triumphant barbarian enemy. Had it not been for Paul--if one may guess at what might have been--no man would now remember the Roman and Greek civilisation. Barbarism proved too powerful for the Graeco-Roman civilisation unaided by the new religious bond; and every channel through which that civilisation was preserved, or interest in it maintained, either is now or has been in some essential part of its course Christian after the Pauline form." (Ramsay, Pauline and Other Studies, p.99.) And an equally fine word of Gotthard Lechler describes the still larger meaning of Paul's influence:

"Paul has inestimable importance, both for the Church of Christ and for humanity in general. Not only was he the first to bring out the unity of the human race inherent in the person of the God-man into clear perception, but also to establish it practically and in fact. In pre-Christian times, divided and disunited humanity longed after the union and interpenetration of the different races and nationalities. But nothing good came of it. (Comp. Bunsen, Hippolytus, I, pp.131,257; Schaff, Kirchengesch, I, 471, etc.) Conquering Rome was just then occupied with uniting all the known world into its empire. But all its conquests and its wonderful gift of ruling produced only a formless mass of peoples, a gigantic body without a uniting spirit, naturally so, because itself had not this spirit, but was of the old man which is fleshly, being of the earth and itself earthy. When the second man came,--the Lord from heaven, who is Spirit,--it became possible to bring mankind into actual unity, beginning from with-

in, by virtue of the one life-giving Spirit, (I Cor. XV:45,47.) under the one head, which is Christ. The instrument of God who was called to establish this unity in thought and deed was Paul. As a true Israelite without falsehood, and, at the same time, by the grace of Christ as the apostle of the Gentiles, with deep spiritual doctrinal development, but, at the same time, with that stupendous missionary activity which he had from the grace of God, with his marvellous spiritual gift of rule and original power of organising, he united Jews and Hellenes in one Church, in one family, under one Head and Lord, in one faith and in brotherly love, and brought together the different Churches of the East and West into one body, so as to become one Church of Christ. The walls of partition thrown down by the divine-human personality and propitiatory death of Jesus, were completely destroyed by the Apostle Paul. Though he did not, it is true, complete and carry through the work of uniting the human race, yet there is still a hope at this day of reaching that goal, and we in faith expect it; but Paul put the first hand to the united structure, building on the foundation which was laid, viz., Jesus Christ; which is his world-historical, immortal work." (Lechler, Apostolic and Post Apostolic Times, Vol. I, p.150.) (~~Race and Race Relations - pgs. 248-252~~).

There are some specific aspects of the race issue in the early Church of which something more is to be said. There was a strong anti-Gentile prejudice in Judaism. There was a strong Anti-Semitic prejudice among the Gentiles. The early Church had to meet these without and deal with them within. There were the questions, still unanswered today, What is Judaism? What is a Jew? And the question, Were Christians a Third Race, or what became of race in Christianity?

The racial antipathy of the Jew to the Gentile we have already noted. It had long existed toward the Gentile heathen world. It was carried over against the Gentile Christian and perhaps not less against the Jewish Christian also. It appears throughout the Book of Acts. There is no evidence in the New Testament of Christian intolerance or prejudice toward Jews. There is abundant evidence of Jewish intolerance and prejudice toward Christians. Leaving out of account the representations of the Gospels the remaining evidence is too full. (Acts IV, 1-3, 21; V, 17, 18, 40; VI, 11-33, 59; VIII, 1-3; XIII, 45; XIV, 5, 19; XVII, 5; XVIII, 12; XXI, 27, 28; XXIII, 12; II Cor. XI, 24; I Thess. II, 14.) Historically anti-Christianity on the part of Jews preceded anti-Semitism on the part of Christians. In the mind of primitive Christianity both were wrong.

~~Jews~~ . There were indeed instances of a better attitude, just as there were in Judaism toward alien races. Schurer does full justice to this better mind among the Jews ("The Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ", Div. II, Vol. II, pp. 297-327) and he also recognizes fully the measure of toleration which at times and places the Romans exercised toward the Jews, (Ibid, pp. 252-280) but his summary judgment is that "the feelings cherished toward the Jews through the entire Graeco-Roman world were not so much those of hatred as of pure contempt. The prevailing tone that runs through the whole estimate of Judaism, as given by Tacitus, is that of the profoundest contempt, the contempt of the proud Roman for this depectissima pars servientium, for this teterrima gens. (Tacitus, His. v. 8.) Those feelings have found their bitterest expression in the words of Marcus Aurelius as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus: Ille enim cum Palaestinam transiret Aegyptum petens, Judaeorum factentium et tumultantium saepe taedio percitus dolenter dicebat exclamasse: O Marcomanni, O Quadi, O Sarmatae, tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni. (Ammian, Marcellin, xxii. 5.)" (Ibid - pg. 297). This Roman hostility to the Jews appears in the New Testament. (Rom. XI, 48; Acts XVI, 20; XVIII, 2.)

The first Christians were at first Jews. They suffered at the outset accordingly from the Gentile anti-Semitic prejudice. Not unnaturally the Gentile world regarded them as Jews, (Acts XVI, 20; XVIII, 15; XXV, 8), and they ~~avowed~~ and claimed their own Jewish racial standing and inheritance. (Gal. II, 15; Phil. III, 5, 6; I Cor. XII, 13; Acts XXII, 3; XXIII, 6; XXVI, 5). Soon, however, Christian Jews or Jewish Christians

were distinguished from their racial background and ~~affiliation~~ and the spread of the Gospel brought into the Church Gentile Christians who had no Jewish race relationship, and the Gentile world came to recognize the Christian community as a distinct Gentile group. The persecution of this group accordingly by fellow Gentiles became a *case* of religious intolerance and not of race prejudice. As a matter of fact, however, the Christians regarded themselves and came to be regarded by others as a "Third Race." Paul ~~was~~ ^{used} the striking phrase. "The Jews, the Gentiles and the Church of God." (I Cor. X, 32). He calls the Christians "a peculiar people" (Titus II, 14). They spoke of themselves as "separated" (II Cor. VI, 17; Heb. VII, 26.). The general recognition of the Christian Church as a "Third Race", however, came only later than the early times which we are alone considering. (~~Harnack, "The Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries", Vol. I, pp. 336-352. Eusebius, "Christians as a Third Race".~~) In its presentation of the Gospel to the Gentile world, to the non-Jewish races the early Church denied the validity of all race distinctions and proclaimed a universal message, the truth of one God and Father, of one Lord and Savior, one salvation available and valid for all men, one judgment to which all men must come. To this Gospel and in this Gospel there were no separations of race. As Harnack says, "It laughed at the barriers of nationality" (Op.cit., Vol. II, p. 392). All this we have already seen.

But did the early Church succeed in obliterating race distinctions within itself? Not entirely. But any evidence of racial prejudice in the Church which the New Testament presents is evidence also of the effort of the Church to eradicate all such prejudice and of its conviction that there is no place for it in Christian principles or Christian relationships. It was indeed a matter not of race but of group feeling which led to the appointment of the first *deacons* of the Church in Jerusalem. (Acts VI, 1-6). The "Grecians" were not Gentile *proselytes*, in which case it might have been a matter of race. They were Jews of the *dispersion*. (John VII, 35) who had taken on Greek ways. The jealousy, with which the Apostles dealt so tactfully, was between the *Hebrew* Christians who had never been out of Palestine or who had adhered rigidly to the Jewish language and *usage*, and these Grecian Jewish Christians. Very soon, however, the question of the *Gentile converts*, Christian disciples who were not Jews, became one of the living and urgent issues. As already noted the history of primitive Christianity has more than once been rewritten in terms of the conflict between Jewish Christian and Gentile Christian in the Church. We are content, however, to accept the thoroughly candid story of the New Testament. Luke sets forth clearly in the Book of Acts the existence of the problem and its honest brotherly solution (Acts X, XI, XV). And Paul's Epistles show clearly the development of thought which made the Church comprehensive of Jew and Gentile alike. The relation of the Christian *message* to Jewish thought and history and institution was worked out gradually under the guidance of God's Spirit, but this matter of race relations did not need to be worked out. It was solved from the outset by Jesus' own *principle*, "All ye are brethren" and by the fact of His all embracing Life and Lordship: (Rom. X, 12; Gal. III, 26-28; Eph. II, 14-18; IV, 4-6; Col. III, 9-11) Where in this unity men knew themselves to be one, there was no line of race and there is no sign of any ~~human~~ line of color. Human relationships of all kinds in Christ lay beneath and above and across all *cleavages* of race.

But at the same time, primitive Christianity did not deny or ignore race. It saw the diversity of race as one of the provisions of God for the enrichment and fulfilment of humanity. Paul's doctrine of the specialization of function and inter-dependence of *man's members* in the *body* of Christ obviously includes far more than the matter of individual Christian personalities and relationships. It begins with a racial reference and inclusion (I Cor. XII, 12-27). Each racial element in the *universal* Christian organism has its own part to play, its own work to do, its own contribution to make. John sets this forth in great words in his vision of the new heaven and the new earth and the Holy City coming down out of heaven from God: "And I saw no temple therein: for the

Lord God Almighty and the Lamb are the temple of it. And the city had no need of the sun, neither of the moon, to shine in it: for the glory of God did lighten it, and the Lamb is the light thereof. And the nations of them which are saved shall walk in the light of it: and the kings of the earth shut at all by day for there shall be no night there. And they shall bring ~~the glory and honour of the nations into it.~~ the glory and honour of the nations into it." (Rev. XXI - 22-26) And John's word for "nation" is the word for "race".

No more interesting problem can be suggested than the problem which early Christianity raised as to what Judaism is and what is a Jew. Paul conceived Judaism to be God's preparation for Christianity. (Gal. III, 24) It should have been absorbed in that for which it was intended to prepare the way. Christ came to His own. His own ought to have welcomed Him and followed Him (John I, 11). Paul strove to persuade Judaism to take this view, and he held to the faith that some day Judaism would do so. (Rom. XI, XI; Gal. III- V;) Christianity in Paul's view was the true fulfilment of all that Judaism had thought and ~~desired~~ ^{desired} and hoped for. It not only fulfilled but it transcended all their longings and thoughts and dreams. And a Jew in His view was never so truly a Jew as when he ~~said~~ ^{saw} this and recognized in Christ all and ~~more~~ ^{more} than all of his hopes. (Rom. II, 28,29) If one asks today, What is Judaism? What is a Jew? Judaism and Jews give conflicting answers. A race, a nation, a religion - each of these answers is given and denied. (Art. by ~~Frank Boas~~ ^{Frank Boas}, "The World Tomorrow", Jan. 1923; Dixon "The Racial History of Man" pp. 162, 164; Art. by Bertrand Alexander "The Living Age, June 23, 1923; Dieraelli, "Civility", BK. IV. Ch. X, XV: Sermon, Rabbi Nathan Krass, "New York Times", Dec. 3, 1923; Letters, by Leo Newmark and others in "The Nation," May 16, 1923; Spear, "Race and Race Relations", pp. 402-414; Art. by George Sokolsky, in "Liberty", Apl. 1, 3, 1939). Paul and the early Church would maintain that the only valid answer is the answer of the New Testament, set forth at length in the Epistles to the Romans and the Hebrews.

Of all the characteristics of primitive Christianity which we need to recover today, none is more essential and more vitally indispensable than its doctrine of race. The nationalistic and racial ideologies of today deny the fundamental Christian ~~postulates~~ ^{postulates}. They give us a world of strife and ~~division~~ ^{division} and hate. Primitive Christianity proclaims a world of unity and brotherhood and love. The modern ideologies ~~maintain~~ ^{maintain} leave man ~~hopeless~~ ^{hopeless}. The one possible bond and basis of a united and rationally ordered human society is the Holy Catholic Church, using the words in the sense of the Apostles' Creed. Every other proposed basis of a peaceful world order has broken down; diplomacy, international organizations, "nine-power treaties," leagues and covenants, ententes, alliances, "axes," all world associations of whatever sort. Even greed has failed. Indeed greed has worse than failed. Men sell to their nation's enemies the very instruments for their enmity. No words seem more pitiable today than Mr. Kipling's "Peace of Dives."

"The word came down to Dives in torment where he lay,
'Our world is full of wickedness, My children maim
and slay;

And the Saint and Seer and Prophet
Can make no better of it
Than to sanctify and prophesy and pray."

So Dives rose up and bound the world together in irrefragable peace.

"With gold and fear and hate
I have harnessed state to state.
And with hate and fear and gold their hates are tied...."
"And behold all earth is laid
In the peace which I have made."

Ten years after Kipling wrote, Dives' peace was burned ashes and Dives had no need to go back to hell. (~~The Spiritual Resources of Christian~~)

Higher Education. - Pg. 14) (cf. Westcott, "Social Aspects of Christianity," 64)
pg. 64)

- In the primitive Christian brotherhood is the only principle of a rational and ordered human life, transcending race but also glorifying it, the only hope, and thank God, the ~~only~~ ^{true} assurance of the golden year.

"We sleep and wake and sleep, but all things move,
The Sun flies forward to his brother Sun;
The dark Earth follows wheel'd in her ellipse:
And human things returning on themselves
Move onward, leading up the golden year.

"Ah, tho' the times when some new thought can bud
Are but as poets' seasons when they flower,
Yet seas, that daily gain upon the shore,
Have ebb and flow conditioning their march,
And slow and sure comes up the golden year.

"When wealth no more shall rest in mounded heaps,
But smit with freer light shall slowly melt
In many streams to fatten lower lands,
And light shall spread, and man be liker man
Thro' all the season of the golden year.

.. .. .

"Fly, happy happy sails. . .

Fly happy with the mission of the Cross;
Knit land to land, and blowing heavenward
With silks, and fruits, and spices, clear of toll,
Enrich the markets of the golden year.

"But we grow old. Ah! when shall all men's good
Be each man's rule, and universal Peace
Lie like a shaft of light across the land,
And like a lane of beams athwart the sea,
Thro' all the circle of the golden year?"

Penyson, The Golden Year,

(Missions and Politics in Asia.) p.220.)

The Early Church as a Fellowship.

When Christianity began it was as a companionship, primarily with Christ and inevitably therefore with others who had entered into companionship with Him. ~~He~~ ^{Jesus} began His ministry by inviting men to join Him. "Come after Me", He said to Simon and Andrew (Mark I.16-17). "And on the morrow He was minded to go forth into Galilee and He findeth Philip and Jesus saith unto him; Follow me." (John I.43f.) The character and form of His call to men appear not to have changed from the first to the last. What they were at the beginning they remained throughout His ministry. To the disciple who wished to go home and buy his father, He said, "Follow Me and leave the dead to buy their own dead" (Matt.VIII,22). He saw Matthew sitting at the place of ~~fall~~ and said, "Follow Me (Matt.IX.9). "And He called unto him the multitude with His disciples and said unto them, "If any man would come after Me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow Me." (Mark VIII.34). To the Rich Young Ruler He spoke in the same terms, "Follow Me" (Mark X.21). This was the essence of discipleship. "He that followeth Me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of life" (John VIII,12). He likened His disciples to sheep who know their master's voice and follow him. (John X. 4-27). As His mission drew to a close this was still his method and principle. To be a Christian was to be His companion. "If any man serve Me, let him follow Me and when I am there also shall my servant be." (John XII. 26). And at the end of all, after His crucifixion, in His appearance to the ~~seven~~ ^{seven} Simon disciples ~~in Galilee~~, in the last story of the Gospel of John, when Peter was restored to his full discipleship again, Jesus's summons was what it had always been, "Follow thou me." (John XXI.19-22).

"Coming to Christ" is not a modern ~~cant~~ ^{is} expression for discipleship. And to the first disciples it was not a metaphor or a figure of speech. It was a literal act, a response to a personal, audible and visible invitation. "Come to Me" was how it all began. "Come unto Me all ye that labor and are heavy laden". (Matt.XI,28). And His ~~lament~~ ^{is} over Israel was, "Ye will not come unto Me" (John V,39).

It was in just this simple unecclesiastical way that the Church began. It was a band of companions gathered about and united by the Great Companion. The true instinct of the translators of the Bible has used the word "Company" as the best English equivalent of a number of ~~Greek~~ ^{is} words. Luke ~~was~~ ^{uses} the word of the first church in Jerusalem. "And being let go they went to their own company" (Acts IV.23). The apostles and elders at Antioch chose Paul and Barnabas "out of their company" (Acts.XV,22). ~~Note also Acts XXI, 8, Rom. XV.24, Heb. XII.22.~~ Paul calls Epaphroditus, "My companion" (Phil. II.25) and John begins the ~~Revelation~~ ^{is}, "I John, your brother and companion". (Rev.I,19). And in the choice of an apostle to take the place of Judas ~~it was~~ ^{is} at once felt that it was a necessary qualification that the one chosen should be from "the men who have companied with us all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us" (Acts I,21).

There were to be sure other notes in primitive Christianity. There was the note of witness. Our Lord spoke of his own witness-bearing and of God's witness to Him. (John III,11;V,31-33). John calls Jesus "the faithful witness" (Rev.I.5). He foretold that the Gospel would be preached as a witness to all nations (Matt.XXIV.14). Judas's successor must be a companion of Jesus and also one who could "become a witness with us of His resurrection" (Acts.I.22). The apostles gave their "witness". (Acts II.32, III,15.V.33) Paul's great business and that of the whole body of Christians was fundamentally testimony. (~~Acts XXII,15,XXVI,16. Luke XXIV,48. Acts I,8.X,41,XIII,31.~~ The first disciples were not sent forth to argue as to the deity of Christ or the truth of the Gospel. They were simply to bear testimony ~~of~~ ^{is} faithful witnesses of what they had seen and knew. (~~Acts X,42,XX,24. Eph. IV,17, I John I,2,3; IV,14; Acts VIII,25; XVIII,5; XXII,18; XXIII,11; XXVIII,23, I Cor.XV,15.~~ The Gospel itself was testimony. (~~I Cor. I,6,II,1. I Tim.II,6. II Tim.I,8. Rev. LXI; XIX,10.~~

And there was the note of work, pressing and urgent. The disciples had seen the intensity of Jesus and heard His own words: "We must work the works

of Him that sent me while it is day; the night cometh when no man can work" (John IX, 4). "My Father worketh hitherto and I work" (John V, 17). "My treat is to finish His work" (John IV, 34). "I have finished the work which Thou gavest me to do." (John XVII, 4). As His own family watched Him they declared He was "beside Himself" (Mark III, 21) and His ~~own~~ disciples "remembered that it was written, 'Zeal for Thy house shall eat me up'" (John II, 17). To the early Christians life was a work (I Cor. III, 13-15). James' Epistle is full of the conception. Christianity that is not work is spurious. And Paul's life and words are not less clear and emphatic. He speaks of "the work of the ministry", "the work of Christ", "the work of faith", "the work of an evangelist" (Eph. IV, 12; Phil. II, 30. II Thess. I 11; II Tim. IV, 5). Christians were "workers together with God." (II Cor. VI, 1). And "work" in Paul's mind was not metaphorical or spiritual alone. He worked with his "own hands" (I Cor. IV, 12) and had others to do so. (Eph IV, 28) Working with one's own hands was a good substitute for theft, and it was the necessary condition of participation in the Christian companionship with its mutual helpfulness (II Thess III, 11). Side by side with "witnessing", "working" was a central Christian principle; of man for man and God and of God for man. (I Cor. XII, 10, Heb. XIII, 21, Mark XVI, 20, Eph. I, 19; III, 8; IV, 16; Phil. III, 21. Col. I, 29).

And there was also the note of worship. The picture in the first chapter of the Book of Acts of the daily life of the earliest Christian community shows it pervaded with glowing and worshipful devotion:

"And they continued stedfastly in the apostles doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers. And they, continuing daily with one accord in the temple, and breaking bread from house to house, did eat their meat with gladness and singleness of heart. Praising God, and having favor with all the people. And the Lord added to the church daily such as should be saved." (Acts II, 42, 46, 47).

"We are the circumcision", says Paul, "who worship by the spirit of God and glory in Christ Jesus" (Phil, III, 3).

And lastly there was the note of order, of organization.

But all these notes were social, collective, corporate. The note of order or organization was inevitably so. It was indeed a very simple organization which one finds in the New Testament. The elaborate ecclesiastical forms and authorities of later times have to be read into the New Testament. They can be understood as developments from it and out of it but they are not in it. Nevertheless the spirit of unity and order and fellowship, without which the forms are futile, was there and was the central and controlling principle. While Jesus was still visibly present He was the order and organization of the company. There was no other. When He was gone the company did not disintegrate. It threatened to do so, but the Resurrection reunited it and the Holy Spirit, who came as Jesus had promised, supplied the principle and power of cohesion, the principle and power of unity in love and truth. There was no confusion of disassociated individualism. (I Cor. XIV. 33, James III, 16) There was order and decency. (Col. II. 5, I Cor. XIV. 40, Titus I, 5.) The Church was a company of loving people.

And witness and work and worship were all social and collective among the first Christians, "Ye shall be my witnesses", said Jesus in His parting words. (Acts I, 8) Matthias was to be a "witness with us" (Acts I, 22). "We are witnesses" said the apostles (Acts II, 32: III, 15: V. 32; X, 39) The disciples were all together on Pentecost. (Acts II, 1). Their witness was companionate. And so also their worship. They gathered in the Temple and they met from house to house. (Acts II, 42, 46) The home of Mark's mother appears to have been a social and religious gathering place. (Acts XIII, 5, 12). And both in Acts and in the Epistles we see the Christians working together, in pairs or in companies. Indeed Jesus Himself had sent out the apostles two by two. (Mark VI. 7; XI, 1). And later we see Paul and Barnabas first and, thereafter, couples and companies at work proclaiming the Gospel and building the Church.

The very terms by which the early Christian company was described and defined show what its essential principle and character were. These terms were, in Greek, ecclesia or Church, and *koinonía*, translated in our King

James Version "fellowship" (Phil. II, 1) Acts II, 42) ~~the~~ ^{or "communication"} (I Cor. X, 16, II Cor. XIII, 14) and ^{"contribution"} or "communication" as exhibiting and offering a proof of fellowship" (Rom. XV, 26, II Cor. VIII, 14; IX, 13; Gal. VI, 6, Phil. IV, 14, 15; I Tim. VI, 18, Heb. XIII, 16).

Christianity did not create either of these words. This needs to be remembered, especially in the case of the former, the word ecclesia or "church". We must not read back into the word as found in the New Testament meanings which may be ^{legitimately} associated with it now but which were not in the New Testament. And yet the New Testament meanings are sufficiently rich and significant. It appears ^{at these} times on our Lord's ^{lips}: "Upon this rock I will build my Church" (Matt. XVI, 18); and then of the Christians in any particular village, "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." (Matt. XVIII, 17). "This is the earliest use of the word ecclesia to denote the Church of Christ, the whole 'congregation of faithful men'", wrote Dean Mansel in "The Bible Commentary". "In the Septuagint and the apocryphal books the word is frequently employed in a similar sense, sometimes to denote the whole people of Israel as the ^{chosen} of God, sometimes for ~~from~~ a special assembly collected on a ^{given} occasion. In the ^{former} sense, which most nearly corresponds to the ^{ground} conception of the Christian Church, St. Stephen speaks of the 'church in the wilderness'". (Acts VII, 38).

The word is not found elsewhere in the four Gospels. But though John does not use it either in his Gospel or in his First and Second Epistle he does use it three times in his Third Epistle, each time of the Christian company to which Gaius, to whom the Epistle is addressed, belonged (III John, 6, 9, 10), and then repeatedly in the Book of Revelation, in the first three chapters and once later in XXII, 16. In every case John uses the word, as Westcott says, "of the special society in a particular place."

In the Book of Acts and in Paul's Epistles, however, it is an entirely different matter. For the most part, indeed, the word means simply the local company of Christians. This is the usage throughout Acts, ^{speaking} ^{(Luke} of the church which was in Jerusalem (Acts XI, 22) or at Antioch (Acts XIII, 1) or "the churches". (Acts XVI, 5) but when he quotes Paul's speech to the elders of the church of Ephesus, he gives faithfully the larger ^{connotation} which the word came to ^{have} in the thought of Paul. Yet in Paul's letters, too, the basic idea is of the simple, local company of Christians, believers and friends in Christ. All five references to the church in Romans are of this character - the Church in Cenchrea, the Church in the house of Priscilla and Aquila and the little ^{company} of Christians everywhere. In the forty-four uses of the word in the Epistles to the Corinthians, Galatians, Philippians, Thessalonians, Timothy and Philemon, all but four or five refer to local companies of believers. In these four or five Paul speaks not of a local church but of "the Church of God," (I Cor. XI, 22, Gal. I, 13, Phil. III, 6, I Tim. III, 15). And in Ephesians and Colossians (and I Cor. XII, 28) he ~~raises~~ rises to a conception of the Church, so deep and so high that we must return to it if we would appreciate the real character of the primitive Christian fellowship.

Meanwhile, we need to note the use of the other word ~~for it~~ - ^{Koinonia}. Sometimes it is translated "fellowship": "the apostles' teaching and fellowship" (Acts II, 42), "the fellowship of His Son Jesus Christ our Lord" (I Cor. I, 9), "the fellowship in the ministry to the saints" (II Cor. VIII, 4); "the right hands of fellowship". (Gal. II, 9); "fellowship in the Gospel" (Phil. I, 5) "fellowship of the Spirit" (Phil. II, 1) "the fellowship of His sufferings" (Phil. III, 10); "the fellowship of thy faith" (Philemon 6); "our fellowship is with the Father" (I John I, 3); "fellowship one with another" (I John I, 6, 7). Sometimes the word is translated "partake" or "partaking". (I ~~John~~ ^{John} IV, 13, II John II); sometimes "communion", as in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, of the communion of the blood and body of Christ (I Cor. X, 16); and in the benediction, "the communion of the Holy Spirit". (II Cor. XIII, 14). And as already indicated it is used for fellowship in giving, for sharing with those in need. (Rom. XV, 26; II Cor. IX, 13, Phil. IV, 15, Heb. XIII, 16).

As we look at primitive Christianity, accordingly, what we see is this happy fellowship, "the communion of the saints", of which we speak in the Creed, which took in indeed, the unseen company of the dead. (Heb. XII, 1, 22, 23)- And note Paul's reference to "baptism for the dead." (I Cor. XV, 29) The community was, as Peter called it a "brotherhood." (I Peter II, 17). "Brother" and "brethren" were the familiar and favorite titles and terms of address: "Brother Saul" (Acts IX, 17; XXII, 13), "Quartus, a brother" (Rom. XVI, 23), "Sosthenes, our brother" (I Cor. I, 1), "our brother Apollos," (I Cor. XVI, 12), "Timothy, our brother," (II Cor. I, 1), "Titus, my brother" (II Cor. II, 13), "Epaphroditus, my brother" (Phil. II, 25); and so Peter also, "Silvanus, a faithful brother" (I Peter V, 12) and "our beloved brother Paul." (II Peter III, 15). And the word "brethren" as a term of description or address occurs nearly two hundred times. Back of all this was the warrant of Jesus Himself. "Be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your Teacher and all ye are brethren" (Matt. XVIII, 8).

There is something very significant in the fading out of the concept of the Kingdom ~~and~~ the New Testament and the substitution for it of this idea of the community, the fellowship, the brotherhood, the family--the Church and the Family of God, (Eph. III, 14, 15). In Matthew "the Kingdom of Heaven" is the central phrase in the teaching and preaching of Jesus and the same place is held by "the Kingdom of God" in Mark and Luke. There are to be sure only four references to the Kingdom in the Gospel of John, but the word occurs over a hundred times in the Synoptics. And in ~~his~~ ^{Paul's} Epistles the conception does not disappear but it is generally the spiritual or heavenly rather than an earthly, social Kingdom that he has in mind. "The things concerning the Kingdom of God" were the theme of Paul's preaching. (Acts XIX, 8; XX, 25; XXVIII, 23, 31) "The Kingdom of God is not eating and drinking but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. XIV, 17). So also in I Cor. IV, 20. VI, 9, Col. I, 13, I Thess. II, 12, while the conception of an inheritance to be entered upon, a Kingdom to come, even a heavenly, is in Gal. V, 21, Eph. V, 5; Col. IV, 11; II Thess. I, 5, II Tim. IV, 1, 18. Peter's only ~~explicit~~ reference is to "the everlasting Kingdom of our Lord" (II Peter I, 11).

Christ was indeed the King of the early Christians. ~~His~~ ^{thus} and the revolutionary influence of the Gospel, ~~was~~ the charges brought against Paul and Silas at Thessalonica. "These that have turned the world upside down ~~such~~ ~~and~~ come hither also, whom Jason hath received, and these all act contrary to the decrees of ~~Romans~~ Caesar, saying that there is another king, one Jesus". (Acts XVII, 6, 7). To Christian faith Jesus Christ was King and King of Kings. (I Tim. VI, 15; Rev. XVII, 14; XIX, 16).

But Paul sought to lead the thought of the early Church beyond the conception of external relations of a King to his subjects, ~~or~~ of followers to a Leader, or of companions to a Great Companion or even of brethren to an Elder Brother. In the Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians he anticipated and transcended ~~our~~ modern corporate conception of society as an organism, not metaphorically only, but in a true sense biologically, in his doctrine of the Christian community, the Church, as a body of which Christ was the Head.

"There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling: One Lord, one faith, one baptism, One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all. ~~But unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Wherefore he saith, When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men. (Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into the lower parts of the earth? He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.)~~ And he gave some, apostles; and some, prophets; and some, evangelists; and some, pastors and teachers; For the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ: Till we all come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ: ~~That we hence henceforth be no more children, tossed to and fro, and carried about with every wind of doctrine, by the sleight of men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive: But, speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: From whom~~

the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love." (Eph. IV, 4-16).

The same rich doctrine with added touches is found in Colossians I, 24 - III, 4. These letters of Paul and John's Gospel with its doctrine of the common and communicated life of Christ and His disciples (John VI, 35 ~~48-58~~, XV, 45) show to what depth and height the earliest Church carried its ideal of the Christian fellowship and of the unity of its members with one another and with Christ. *Christians are only one with Christ. They are one in Christ.*

But did the first Christians realize in actual *experience* and in daily human relationships this divine ideal? Perfectly, no. And yet *social* enough to make of Christianity a new and revolutionary *social* and moral power, and to supply in the Church a school for the language and ideal of "the heavenly Kingdom", "the Body of Christ," as Horace Bushnell has shown in one of his most glorious sermons, "God Organizing in the Church His Eternal Society."

The actual Christian fellowship was real. The Christians cared for their poor. The difficulties described in Acts VI, 1-7, the counsel of the leaders of the Jerusalem church to Paul and Barnabas (Gal. II, 10) the contributions collected by Paul from the Gentile churches for the poor Christians in Jerusalem (Rom. XV, 26, I Cor. XVI, 3) and the stinging words of James regarding any unChristian treatment of the poor (James II, 2-6) are sufficiently illustrative. The Christian communities took care of their members. The Epistles to the Thessalonians, show that there were drones and parasites and noisy trouble-makers but the churches dealt with these with good sense (II Thess. III, 10). Honesty, industry, brotherly kindness were the marks of true discipleship. (Eph. IV, 25 - V, 21, II Cor. VI, 6; Col. III, 12, II Peter I, 7). There was an immense ~~trade~~ development of trades in the Roman Empire with local organizations of *artisans* and traders everywhere. Dill, in "Roman Society from Nero to Marcus Aurelius" (p. 265f), describes this development and adds, "The great object of association among these humble people appears to have been not so much the protection of their trade, as the cheerfulness of intercourse, the promotion of fellowship and good will, the relief of the dullness of humdrum lives." The first Christian communities were just such associations; they more than achieved these objects and they had ~~the same (and more)~~ *even more* social inclusiveness *than* the Roman trades unions (Dill p. 266).

The New Testament picture of the primitive Christian fellowship is an honest picture. It holds clear the ideal but it shows with what difficulties and failures the ideal had to strive. There were *envies* (Phil. I, 15; I Tim. VI, 4; James IV, 5, I Peter II, 1) and contentions (Acts XV, 30; I Cor. I, 11, Titus III, 9, I Cor. XI, 16) and strife (II Cor. XII, 20, Gal. V, 20, Phil. II, 3, James III, 14, 16; Rom. XIII, 13, I Cor. III, 3, II Tim. II, 23). There quibbling over words (I Tim. VI, 4). Two women were at odds in the Church at *Philippi* (Phil. IV, 2, 3). There must also have been brotherly hatred ~~as~~ John would not have spoken so plainly and severely about it. (I John II, 9, III, 15, IV, 20). But we only know about these things from their *faithful* condemnation. The teachers of the early Church countenanced nothing that marred the peace and purity and unity of the fellowship.

The clearest and fullest instance of this is in Paul's grief and condemnation in the matter of the divisions in the Church in Corinth. Paul had spoken of the matter plainly in writing to the Romans. "The only division which he would countenance," he said, "was a division from those who caused division!"

"Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them." (Rom. XVI, 17).

But the sin of schism seems to have been most pronounced at Corinth (I Cor. 10-17, XI, 18). Of these divisions he wrote plainly "Ye are yet carnal: for whereas there is among you envying, and strife, and divisions, are ye not carnal, and walk as men?" (I Cor. III, 3) Paul was no trifler with life and truth and he was prepared for clear separation from all who

were disloyal to the *Centre* of the Gospel, ^{to} the deity of Jesus Christ and His supreme Lordship and ^{to} purity. (II Cor. VI. 14-18, I Cor. XVI, 22, II Thess. III, 6). And John ^{is} equally positive. (I John II, 22, 23.) But ^{So} ~~so~~ supreme in Paul's thought was the principle of the unity of the fellowship that in the Corinthian controversy, though one party bore his own name, presumably in special fidelity to his doctrine, he refused to sanction the partisan divisions whatever their views may have been over which they were divided. *Dr. Kere* Barth says: "It was far from his thoughts to rush in helpfully to the assistance of this, his own party, in its controversies with others; or to intervene as arbitrator and peacemaker between it and those which called themselves after Apollos and Peter (i. 12). In his view, the question as to which amongst these groups was relatively most right, and the other question as to how the disputants could be reconciled, were manifestly quite secondary in comparison with the need for making all of them realize that it was not meet that the testimony of Christ set up among them, in contrast to the phenomena of the variegated religious fair, in the midst of which the Church life of the Corinthian Christians was lived, should be made into a cause, an idea, a programme, an occasion for intellectual exuberance and spiritual heroics, as this obviously is the essence of all religious movements and schools of thought, however excellent their intentions and ~~deep~~ deep rooted their foundations. The main defect of Corinthian conditions, from this point of view, Paul sees to consist in the boldness, assurance, and enthusiasm with which they believe, not in God, but in their own belief in God and in particular leaders and heroes; in the fact that they confuse belief with specific human experiences, convictions, trends of thought and theories--the special human content of which logically makes the recollection of particular human names unavoidable." (Barth "The Resurrection of the Dead" - pg. 14f).

As many of Paul's statements, and John's and Peter's also, make clear ~~in~~ there were limits to the principle of *toleration* of differences in the interest of unity. It cannot be denied that both ~~St.~~ Paul (on moral grounds, Eph. v, 11; on grounds of belief, Rom. xvi. 17; on both grounds, 2 Cor. vi. 14-17; 2 Thess. iii, 6, 14, 15; 1 Tim. vi. 3-5); and ~~St.~~ John (John 9,10) sanctioned the principle of the withdrawal of Christian fellowship even to the extent of social separation. It is equally clear, however, that both they and ~~St.~~ James and ~~St.~~ Peter preached a principle of inclusion far transcending our present Christian practice (~~Rom. xii. 13-21; xiv. 19-21; Gal. v. 14-15; vi. 1-3; Phil. i. 14-18; Col. iii. 11-14; 2 Thess iii. 14-15; 2 Tim. ii. 24, 25; James ii. 2-4, 8, 10-12; 1 Pet. iii. 8; v. 5; 1 John iii. 14; iv. 7, 12, 20; v. 2, 16; John iii. 5-8.~~

One wonders whether it would not be well for us to try to live yet more fully by these normal and regulative ideals of comprehension before we venture too far on the difficult path of judgment and excommunication where our human frailties have ever too free a play.

A great Christian teacher of the last century, Dr. Charles Hodge, dealt wisely with this matter in his history of the "Great Revival of 1740-45":

"The censorious spirit, which so extensively prevailed at this period, was another of those fountains of bitter waters, which destroyed the health and vigour of the church. That it should characterize such acknowledged fanatics as Davenport and his associates, is what might be expected. It was, however, the reproach and sin of far better men. Edwards stigmatizes it, as the worst disease which attended the revival, "the most contrary to the spirit and rules of Christianity, and of the worst consequences." ~~Works, vol. IV. p. 238.~~ The evil in question consists in regarding and treating, on insufficient grounds, those who profess to be Christians, as though they were hypocrites.... It was by the dreadful prevalence of this habit of censorious judging during the revival, that the confidence of the people in their pastors was destroyed, their usefulness arrested, their congregations divided, and the fire-brands of jealousy and malice cast into every society, and almost into every household. It was this, more than anything else, that produced that conflagration in which the graces, the peace, and union of the church were consumed. Though this censorious spirit prevailed most among those who had the least reason to think themselves better than others, it was to a lament-

able degree the failing of really good men.... A few years later, when the evils arising from the rash denunciation of professing Christians and ministers had become more apparent, Mr. Tennent protested against it in the strongest terms. 'It is cruel and censorious judging,' he says, 'to condemn the state of those we know not, and to condemn positively and openly the spiritual state of such as are sound in fundamental doctrines, and regular in life. The way to obtain quickening grace is the path of duty, and not the scandalous practice of that God-provoking, church-rending iniquity, rash judging. This may quicken indeed, but not to any thing good, but to backbiting, slandering, wrath, and malignity, and all manner of mischief. Oh that a gracious God would open the eyes of the children of men, to see the inexpressible baseness and horrors of this detestable impiety, which is pregnant with innumerable evils.' (Irenicum, or Plea for the Peace of Jerusalem, by Gilbert Tennent. Philadelphia, 1749, p.90.) He even denies the right of any man to judge of the spiritual state of others on the ground of their inward experience, or to make such judgment the ground of his public conduct towards them... If the fruit of the Spirit of God is love, joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, then may we be sure that a proud, arrogant, denunciatory, self-confident, and self-righteous spirit is not of God; and that any work which claims to be a revival of religion, and is characterized by such a spirit, is so far spurious and fanatical. All attempts to account for, or excuse such a temper on the ground of uncommon manifestations, or uncommon hatred of sin, or extraordinary zeal for holiness and the salvation of souls, are but apologies for sin. The clearer our apprehensions of God, the greater will be our reverence and humility; the more distinct our views of eternal things, the greater will be our solemnity and carefulness; the more we know of sin, of our own hearts, and of Jesus Christ, the more shall we be forbearing, forgiving, and lamblike, in our disposition and conduct. ~~Gracious affections do not tend to make men bold, noisy, and boisterous, but rather to speak trembling. When Ephraim spake trembling, he exalted himself in Israel.~~ (Edwards on the Affections, p.393). The evidence from Scripture is full and abundant, 'that those who are truly gracious are under the government of the lamb-like, dove-like Spirit of Jesus Christ, and this is essentially and eminently the nature of the saving grace of the gospel, and the proper spirit of true Christianity. We may therefore undoubtedly determine that all truly Christian affections are attended with this spirit, that this is the natural tendency of the fear and hope, the sorrow and joy, the confidence and zeal of true Christians.' (Edwards on the Affections, p.387)." (Hodge's "History of the Presbyterian Church", Vol. II, p.88-90).

Charles Spurgeon has been often quoted in severe condemnation of the tolerant mind and in severe judgment of the disunity and laxity of modern Christianity. It is well to recall, as supplement and commentary, the mellowed statement of the last year of his life: "During the past year I have been made to see that there is more unity and love among God's people than is generally believed. I feel myself a debtor to all God's people upon earth. We mistake our divergences of judgment for differences of heart, but they are far from being the same thing. In these days of infidel criticism, believers of all sorts will be driven into sincere unity."

Christian biography is full of records of lives which have perpetrated and illustrated this tone of mind and spirit of the primitive church. When Ephraim Peabody began his ministry in Cincinnati in 1833, he wrote: "This day I am ordained and knowing how easily I can let into what is wrong I form these rules

for my conduct, resolving with the blessing and aid of Him whose blessing always rests on a good intention to conform my life to them I resolve ... never to criticize the conduct of others in this Society or, if it be so, only to bring their good qualities to light or to excuse their failings and errors. To talk not about persons, but about things - to be kind in my demeanour and to cultivate trust toward all the kind expressions and actions of others - to be in short a brother and a son to my parish, to think as much as possible of the good of others and as little as possible of my personal benefit ... To talk and think little of myself. To make my sermons as practical as I am able to.

and to avoid discussing controversial points which give rise to bad passions...
I remember that I am a minister of Christ - to endeavor to show this in
my conduct, to feel it in my heart... that I may abide by the resolve I
take that and from whom all strength and all good comes." Later, writing from
Cincinnati, he says "There is an awfulness and vastness about the responsi-
bility that swallows up and drowns out almost completely my mind. It
makes me feel how frail and feeble I am. Just I know that God may make
the weakest instrument strong in the accomplishment of His purpose and I
hope that the strength I have may be spent faithfully."

The early Christians embodied this spirit of humbleness and kindness and love. Love, indeed, of which we have not spoken much, was the supreme and controlling note of Christianity. (See Moffett, "Love in the New Testament"; *Raven* "Jesus and the Gospel of Love"). The Incarnation was the fruit of God's love for man (John III, 16; Rom. 48). God Himself was love (I John IV, 8). The love of Christ, i. e. Christ's love, was the very heart of the Gospel (Rom. VIII, 35; Gal. II, 20; II Cor. V, 14; Eph. III, 19, V, 2.) Love is the love of faith and discipleship, (Gal. V, 6. I Thess. I, 3; I Tim. I, 14; II Tim. I, 13; Philem. 5), the disciples love of God and Christ (Rom. VIII, 28; I Cor. II, 9, I Peter I, 8) and the love of disciples one of another. This was the thing which, with all possible tenderness and appeal, Jesus enjoined upon His disciples as His "new commandment". "By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye have love one to another." (John XIII, 35) Love, as nothing else, was the essence, the test and the power of Christianity. This love was not human philanthropy such as men had long known and sometimes idealized. It was a new commandment. Love had been commanded before. It was commanded in the Old Testament law. (Lev. XIX, 28; Matt. XIX, 19, XXII, 37, 39). But this love was something different. "That which is hateful to thee, thou shalt not do to thy neighbors", said *Hillel*. "Ye have heard that it was said", said Jesus, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor and hate thine enemy". (Matt. V, 43) But the new love was positive and included the enemy. (Matt. V, 44) The new love was a transformed and larger love--"not as thyself" but "as I have loved you." It was a love of new character, new motive, new scope, new sanction, establishing a new society bound not by rites or organization but by self-obliterating love. "In truth", as Wendt remarks, "the nature and intensity of the love which Jesus taught and which He Himself manifested were such as had yet no sure basis in the Old Testament knowledge of God and as had not yet been recognized as belonging unconditionally to the righteousness commanded by God" (Wendt - The Teaching of Jesus, Vol. I, P. 360). This is the distinctive originality of New Testament love. It is not humanistic. It is *theistic*. It is of God. As John says, "We love because God first loved us" (I John IV, 19). The New Testament knows no love divorced from God. It did not enter the mind of these first Christians that a man could be "good and loving without God, i. e. without any conscious belief in God." The New Testament conception of love is of a love "not of man's contriving but ~~the~~ *the* product of the divine will *acting* in history and expressing itself in the creation of a community before which there lay a future in the divine purpose freely disclosed by Jesus Christ. To believe this, to become conscious of all that this involved, was deemed essential....According to the New Testament the Church began (and if it fails to continue thus it will soon end) by confessing 'God is love', but only in the spirit of adoring reverence which inspired the song of praise 'to Him who loves us and has loosed us from our sins by shedding His own blood... to Him be glory and dominion forever and ever. Amen'" (Moffat Love in the New Testament. pg. 320ff. See also Maritain "True Humanism" pp. 65f. 198).

The Christian Church was the creation of God's love in Christ. It existed because it believed in God in Christ and had been apprehended by this love (Phil. III, 12) and held it in trust for the whole world with which it began eagerly to seek to share both its faith and ^{its} life in Christ. It is hardly just to the facts of the New Testament to *change* the early church with a ^{narrow} community appropriation of Jesus' ^{the} universalism of love, as Dr. ^{Mc} *Effert* seems to have done, ^{while} at the same time he recognizes ^{fully} what love meant and did in the Christian fellowship:

"That Christians", said he, "should treat all with whom they came in contact with becoming respect, and that they should show them kindness as opportunity offered, and should avoid hatred, resentment, and anger toward them, was of course believed by all; but it was the active exercise of love, not toward one's neighbors in general, but toward one's fellow-disciples, fellow-members of the one household of faith, that was chiefly emphasized. In this the feeling of brotherhood ~~was the main thing~~ in Christ found expression, and the stress laid upon such love is an evidence of the vivid realization of that brotherhood on the part of the early Christians.

Within the circle of disciples the love which Jesus inculcated burned warm and vivid, and one of the most characteristic marks of the life of his followers in the apostolic age was their devotion to one another and their unselfish regard for each other's good. It was this more than anything else that gave its peculiar character to their Christian life, and it did much to attract others to them. That the circle within which love found its chief exercise should thus have been narrowed to coincide with the limits of the Christian brotherhood, instead of retaining that breadth and universality which it had in the thought of Christ, to whom all men were brethren, common sons of a common Father, was due largely to the fact that the Christians regarded themselves as an elect people called by God out of the world and separated from it as his own peculiar possession. This feeling gave them a profound attachment to each other, and marked them off from all without their pale to such a degree that the narrowing of the sphere of love was inevitable." ("The Apostolic Age" Pg. 508f).

But the early Christians did not contract a universal love and world brotherhood into the fellowship of the Christian Company. It was with the Christian company that the world community began. Jesus, Himself, so initiated it. (John XVII, 21, 25, 26) It could not have been otherwise initiated. And though the Gentile mission waited until Paul came, the universal note was there. The faithful records of the ~~synoptic~~ Gospels and of the Book of Acts ~~preserve~~ it in the last missionary commissions of the Savior. Peter soon broke through any inhibitions which were left after Pentecost. (Acts X, XI) In the Gospel of John, it is not Israel, nor the Church only but the world that is the object of God's redeeming love. (John I, 29; III, 16f, VI, 33, 51, XVII, 21) Christ is the Savior of the World (John IV, 42) and the Light of the World (John VIII, 12). In his First Epistle John has the same universal outlook. "He is the propitiation for our sins and not for our's only but also for the whole world" (I John II, 2).

"In this was manifested the love of God toward us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world, that we might live through him. And we have seen, and do testify that the Father sent the Son to be the the Saviour of the world." (I John IV, 9, 14)

Paul's conception of the universality of God's love and of the Gospel is written all over both his thought and his life, and the outreach of his missionary passion embracing all men (I Cor. IX, 19-23) found its ~~norm~~ ~~norm~~ and its power in the strength of his ~~sinners~~ sense of love and unity inside the Christian company. Through the Church the wisdom and love of God were to be manifested to the whole world and to the very heavens.

"Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ: And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: To the intent that now unto the principalities and powers in heavenly places might be known, by the church, the manifold wisdom of God According to the eternal purpose which he purposed in Christ Jesus our Lord. (Eph. III, 8-11). (See the interesting development of the idea of the "Beloved Community" as universal in Royce, "The Problem of Christianity".) And note Paul's great collectivism in Eph. III, 18; IV, 13; II Cor. III, 18. ~~coordination~~ of individual and community).

But, it may be asked, did not the primitive Church surrender this universalism in the tragic conflict which it ~~conceived~~ ~~conceived~~ to exist between the Church and "the world." Not so. "World" was one word but it had two widely different meanings. When John says "God so loved the world", he meant one thing. When he said, "Love not the world" (I John II, 15) he meant something radically different. The world that God loved was the world of His creatures for whose sins Christ was the propitiation (I John II, 2), which Christ came to save (John VI, 33, 51, I John IV, 14), which in Christ God was seeking to reconcile to Himself (II Cor. V, 19). This world was the subject of redemption and its salvation was Christ's mission. But there was another "world", not an order ~~conceived~~ ~~conceived~~ apart from God to be

redeemed and reconciled, but an order opposed to God, alien to the divine and hopelessly hostile to the Gospel. (John VII, 9, XV, 18, XVII, 14, I John III, 1, IV, 14) To this world because it was *inflexibly* opposed to God and the Gospel, because its principles were irreconcilable with the Gospel, Christianity must be uncompromisingly opposed also. "The Apostle of Love is the most outspoken of all in this view.

"Love not the world, neither the things that are in the world. If any man love the world, the love of the Father is not in him. For all that is in the world, the lust of the flesh, and the lust of the eyes, and the pride of life, is not of the Father, but is of the world. And the world passeth away, and the lust thereof; but he that doeth the will of God abideth forever." "For whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith. Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? And we know that we are of God, and the whole world lieth in wickedness." (I John II, 15, 16, 17; V, 4, 5, 19). (See Westcott "Commentary on St. John", note to ch. I, 10, and his essay "The Church and the World" in Commentary on the Epistles of St. John".)

But the other New Testament writers are not less positive and determined. True religion, says James, is to keep unspotted from the world, and he declares that the friendship of the world is enmity with God. (James I, 27; IV, 4) "We have received not the spirit of the world", writes Paul, (I Cor. II, 12). To him and to Peter and Jude the "World" was the flesh as against the spirit. (Rom. XIII, 14; Gal. IV, 17, I Peter II, 11). Jude's expression is characteristically *vivid*: "Hating even the garment spotted by the flesh" (Jude 25).

It is easy to see how such an attitude could be considered ^{as} *narrow* and anti-social. The Christians made distinctions, felt *conjunctions*, erected prohibitions, which seemed intolerant to the contemporary world. There was a deep significance in Paul's *prayer* for the Philippian Christians that they "might distinguish the things that *differ*". It was the conviction that *idolatry* made a difference, that it was wrong, in the name of loyalty, to worship emperors or the state, that produced martyrs. If the early Church had not drawn the line so sharply against the world, the world would soon have sucked the Church under and Christianity would have gone.

To the primitive Church the Gospel was a propaganda of self-sacrificing love. It was also a battle cry summoning Christians to a separation from the world and to an *unrelenting* war with evil. This accounts for Paul's innumerable military metaphors, of warfare (I Cor. IX, 7; II Cor. X, 4, I Tim. I, 18) of fight (I Cor. IX, 26; I Tim. VI, 12; II Tim. IV, 7) of weapons and armor (II Cor. X, 3, 4, Rom. XIII, 12, II Cor. VI, 7, Eph. VI, II, 13). And the *imagery* of Revelation is a battle picture, with evil not passive but malignant and aggressive. (Rev. XI, 7, XIII, 4, 7; XVII, 14; XIX, 11, 19).

Was this concept of the deadly conflict between Christianity and "the world" an illusion of the early Church? On the contrary it is as real and mortal today as it was then and it is on a vaster scale. As an observer in the *heart* of Europe writes, "We are coming back to the first Christian conception of the world. The world is not plastic material to be easily molded by Christian influence. There is a hostile, demonic element. The church has to fight stubbornly against principalities and powers for its faith and Christianity, for the *conversion of peoples* and the spread of the Gospel." And Professor Dibelius wrote in behalf of *German* Christianity in response to the invitation to the Oxford Conference on Life and Work in 1937, "The Churches of the world when they hold their Conferences, shall not be satisfied with discussing problems, but shall wage a war against the demons, who stand behind the great result of the self-conscious and self-justified individual of our day against the living God."

In one of his letters *Canon Liddon* avowed his increasing lack of sympathy with "Evangelicalism", but he added "Whatever is to be said of the 'Evangelical' theology, the strength of the Movement in its early days lay in its renunciation of the 'world'. Judging from my own memories as a boy and a young man, that was the secret of its power, and its renunci-

ation of the world was felt to be a reality" (Johnston, "Life of *Henry*
Parry Liddon", Pg. 282) The Christian attitude to the "world", how-
 ever, was and must ever be far more than renunciation. Today as in the Ro-
 man Empire the "world" confronts the Church in avowed repudiation and en-
 mity. Maritain in "True Humanism" cites some of its assertions of hostil-
 ity. *in Russia* This victory will be preceded...by a universal class hatred with
 regard to capital. That is why christian love, which applies to all, even
 to one's enemies, is the worst adversary of communism--Bukharin, Pravda,
 30th March, 1934. 'There is a virtue which should be your stimulus, should
 be the flame of youth, and the name of this virtue is hatred'--Prof. Bodero
 (to the students of Padua). 'Yes, gentlemen, to hate our enemies and inten-
 sely love our friends. Not to hate, or still worse, to love our enemies, is
 a form of cowardice that no cause which leads to a lasting and serious vic-
 tory can accept'--Scorze, the chief of the Fascist Youth, Gioventu Fascista,
 April 1931 (inresponse to an article in the Osservatore Romano, where it was
 said that 'hatred, a fascist virtue, is not a Christian virtue').
 ("True Humanism" Pg. 282). And he quotes Mussolini's assertions of the
 absolute authority and supremacy of the State, answering very well to the
 New Testament concept of "the world": "We are members of a State which
 controls all the forces which stir within the nation. We control the poli-
 tical forces, we control the moral forces, we control the economic forces,
 we are ~~main~~ the full meaning of the words a corporative fascist State (Sc-
 ritti e Discorsi, 1926). 'I affirm anew and with no less energy my formula
 of my speech in the Scala at Milan: all in the State, nothing outside the
 State, nothing against the State' (Ibid., 1927). ~~See also the quotation~~ *stat*
~~cited on p. 129 (note);~~ and again: 'The ~~fascist~~ State, the highest and
 most potent form of personality, is a force, but a spiritual one. It ass-
 umes all the forms of man's moral and intellectual life. Hence it cannot
 be limited to the simple function of keeping order, as is the wish of lib-
 eralism; it is no simple mechanism which limits the sphere of so-called
 individual liberties. It is the form and interior norm and the discipline
 of the whole person: it penetrates the will as well as the intelligence.
 Its principle, the directive inspiration of human personality socially
 united, descends into the depths of our being and ~~dwells~~ dwells in
 the heart of the man of action as of the thinker, of the artist as of the
 scientist: a soul within the soul' (*Dottrina*). Liberalism makes the State
 serve the individual; Fascism reaffirms the State as the veritable reality
 of the individual' (Ibid.). 'The State, considered as a universal ethical
 will, is the creator of right' (Ibid.)." (Pg. 279)

~~The earlier quotations from Mussolini referred to, were:~~ "Thus,
 According to Signer Mussolini, the State is 'the veritable reality of the
 individual'; the Fascist State is 'the highest and most potent form of
 personality'; 'nothing human or spiritual, in so far as it has any value,
 exists outside the State'; 'its principle, the directing inspiration of hu-
 man personality joined in one society, penetrates into the soul...the soul
 of the soul'". ("True Humanism" - pg. 129)

These frank assertions of war between the ideals and spirit of "the
 world" and the Church found tragic illustration in the engulfment of Austria.
 A friend who was in Vienna when the tragedy occurred whose name and nation-
 ality it is safer not to disclose described in a letter the poignancy of the
 impression made on him by this naked self-assertion of force: "I feel a
 real need, after my experience of the Austrian Revolution in Vienna itself,
 not only to express myself from an objective point of view, voicing a crit-
 ical judgment, but to unburden myself of the oppressive anxiety which weighs
 upon me since I returned from Vienna. While still in Vienna I tried to des-
 cribe simply what I saw. I tried to tell myself what it all meant for the
 European situation, for peace, for the Evangelical Church. I made the effort
 to weigh the situation objectively; to grasp a certain logic of historical
 development, even in the sense that history here was also retribution. But
 even after this is all said, such an oppression remains upon my spirit that
 I simply have to speak out, personally and confidentially, in order to lib-
 erate my soul. I suffered a shock in Vienna, not only as a
 who was compelled to visualize how easily those bombers could fly over ~~me~~
 _____, let us say, and how a strong army could violate a small

country; but also in my European consciousness and in my cultural feeling as a citizen and a human being, as a member of a formerly widespread, far-reaching religious fellowship. I have seen a world, strange and wild, in dangerous proximity. I saw powers at work that frightened me. In personal contact with gentle Austrian individuals of the old culture, and with struggling working men, I looked into a horror and distress which made me shudder.

"One may try for a long time to understand what it is one sees. Something yet remains which is incomprehensible--a threatening force. One may freely admit that the outcome has its positive side, as the corrective of an evil peace treaty; as an expression of the self-determination of peoples. There yet remains the impression of a strange, demonic and dangerous power to which one can neither be united nor reconciled. Never has it come so close; never did I feel so deeply its terrible strength as during that unforgettable thunder of the bomber planes overhead and the rumbling of the tanks in the streets of Vienna--demonic forces which seemed to be led on by the outstretched arm which commands them."

This is the fundamental issue of the world today--the gigantic struggle in the darkness "twixt great evils and the Word." The Satan of force, of will, of materialistic dynamism, of mass might, of anti-human racialism, of class hate and tyranny, of state Caesarism, of a secular and heathen mythology, is loose in the world. By every agency and effort that it can command the Church must join this conflict with its word of truth and love and right and brotherhood and unity, its Christian doctrine of God and of man.

~~(What the Church May Expect of Its Schools and Colleges - Pgs. 14-15)~~

The Christian fellowship grew up at the beginning without self consciousness, as the inevitable result of association with Jesus. After He was gone, first His memory and then the dawning sense of the Christian mission gave this fellowship consciousness and, in the training of God's spirit and the purpose of His will, the fellowship grew into the Church with two great ends, first to be itself, the norm of brotherhood and unity and second to be the agony in the will of God of the unity of mankind. And, in fact, as Professor Farmer has said, "the Church for all its weaknesses stands right at the centre of human affairs in all their chaos and perplexity today. It is the only society which cuts across the false absolute of nationality and bears witness to God whose will stands above all nations". ("The Healing Cross" Pg. 31). ^{the}

It is a hopeful thing that both in and out of the Christian Church to-day men appeal to Christ and to the Christianity of the New Testament in connection with the social and economic issues of our own time. It is natural that Christians should do this. For them the mind of Christ ought to be authoritative and final. But it is significant that men outside the Christian faith should look to the same authority. "There is no better rule", said J. S. Mill, "than that a man should so live that Christ would approve his life". And Miss Scudder in "The Church and the Hour" quotes a statement from "The Masses": "We believe in Jesus. We believe that He lived and died laboring and fighting, in a noble atmosphere of disreputability, for the welfare and liberty of men. To us His memory is the memory of a hero, and perhaps a good deal of our indignation against the Church rises from that. We are indignant, not only because the Church is reactionary but because the Church betrayed Jesus. The Church took Christ's name and then sold out to the ruling classes. The Church is Judas". *Not so.*

What ~~was~~ ^{them} was the view of Christianity at the beginning with regard to such living, present-day issues as private property and wealth, the position of woman and marriage and divorce, war, ~~and~~ the relation of the Church and State, ~~and the issue of slavery which was a living enough issue with us until only eighty years ago.~~

I. Private property and wealth.

Did Jesus believe that it was wrong to own anything? The radical social and economic reformers of our day deny the right of private ownership. They deny it in land, in property, even in the family life. And some of them appeal to the teaching and example of Jesus for their justification. "When Jesus says, 'Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon earth,'" ~~declares~~ declares Naumann, "He shows Himself on ethical grounds a radical opponent of all accumulation of wealth." Is this true? Are all the people who have laid up a little in savings-banks, and all the farmers who own their own farms, and, even more, all the capitalists, doing what Jesus condemned?

1. Jesus nowhere condemned private property. When He said, "Lay not up for yourselves treasures upon the earth" (Matt. ~~V~~:19), He did not do so, nor did He when He said to the young ruler, "Sell all that thou hast, and distribute unto the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow Me" (Luke ~~XIII~~:22). In each of these cases He was appealing to men to forego doing what He did not deny they had the right to do. He was pressing a moral choice on the personal will, not establishing an economic law.

2. On the other hand, He repeatedly recognized the rights of private property. How could the young ruler be advised to sell what modern extremists deny that he rightly owned? When Jesus enjoined charity, it was in terms that recognized property rights. "Sell that ye have, and give alms" (Luke ~~XII~~:33). He commands giving (Matt. ~~V~~:42; Luke ~~VI~~:30). But how can we give what is not ours? The disciples owned boats and nets, and returned to them after Jesus' death (John ~~XI~~:3ff.). Peter owned a house, and entertained Jesus in it (Matt. ~~XXVI~~:14). Zacchaeus welcomed the Saviour to his home and received no rebuke from Jesus for offering merely to restore all that he had unjustly taken, instead of giving all away (Luke ~~XII~~:2-9). Others who had property were loved and praised by Jesus, and no word of censure escaped Him (Matt. ~~XXIII~~:10; Luke ~~VI~~:3; John ~~XII~~:1-5). And many of Jesus' parables deal with the uses of money without indicating a single reproof of its possession (Matt. ~~XXIII~~:14-30; Luke ~~XIII~~:13-27; ~~XVI~~:1-13; ~~XII~~:16-21). ~~study~~ ^{study} in the Epistles of Paul the constant recognition of the rights of private ownership (I Cor. ~~XIII~~:7; I Tim. ~~VI~~:18; I Cor. ~~XIII~~:3; Phil. ~~IV~~:18; I Cor. ~~XIII~~:1-4; ~~II~~ Cor. ~~VI~~:9); and both in the Acts and in the Epistles the evidence of the presence in the Church of many who had possessions (Acts ~~II~~:27; ~~IV~~:7; ~~IV~~:34; ~~XIII~~:8; 16:14,40; 12:12; Rom. ~~XIII~~:23). The early Church did not require communism (Acts ~~II~~:4).

3. Jesus both recognized the right of private ownership and gave directions for the exercise of the right. What we have is to be used for the poor (Luke ~~XIII~~:22), and with genuine lowliness (Matt. ~~VI~~:3). But it may be used also to give expression to the excesses of love in our hearts

of the encircling of years' feet.

(Matt. ~~28~~^{XXVI}: 6-13). The justification of our Christmas giving is in this story. Since Jesus' day a thousand ways have been opened by the very working of His Spirit in the world for the right use of possessions, for human good.

4. Some people have been perplexed because Jesus seems to condemn possessions, while at the same time recognizing them. They feel the teaching we have just considered, but they hear Jesus saying, "Whosoever he be of you that renounceth not all that he hath, he cannot be My disciple" (Luke ~~III~~^{VI}: 33; Matt. ~~XXIX~~^{XXIX}: 29; Luke ~~V~~^V: 11). But only by renouncing all can we hold towards all that attitude of full superiority which is essential to our use of our possessions after the spirit of Christ. We give up all, and we then are where we can be trusted to keep all and use it for men and Jesus. We escape the peril of possessions by renouncing them. Whereupon Jesus commits them to us as trusts to be administered for Him. We have what we have, not as property of our own, but as property of His to be guarded and used as His and not ours (Matt. ~~XXIV~~^{XXIV}: 45, 50; ~~XXIII~~^{XXIII}: 14-30; Luke ~~XXIV~~^{XXIV}: 1-8, 12: 42).

5. Property and person are on the same basis. I am my own, yet I am not my own (I Cor. ~~VI~~^{VI}: 19).
"Our wills are ours to make them Thine."
My property is mine, yet it is not mine. I am steward and trustee of Christ, and to Him must give account (I Cor. ~~IV~~^{IV}: 1, 2; Luke ~~XII~~^{XII}: 2, 11; Rom. ~~XIV~~^{XIV}: 12; Luke ~~XII~~^{XII}: 11-27). Egs. 92-95 from "The Principles of Jesus".

There are three points here, however, regarding which something more should be said.

(1) Is it true that the Church did not begin with the principle of communism? Luke says "And the Multitude of them that believed were of one heart and soul: and not one of them said that aught of the things which he possessed was his own: but they had all things common". Was this not plain and simple communism? "It is as a rule assumed by interpreters of the New Testament with socialist sympathies", wrote Professor Francis A. Peabody, "that the communism of the Book of Acts is a genuine anticipation of the modern practice against capitalism". And he quotes Nitti, "It is certain that the early Christians practiced communism or community of goods... The first Christians, they sought to annihilate it... Christianity was a vast economic revolution more than anything else;" and Herrow, "Apostolic Christianity took seriously the economic facts of the spiritual life. Men understood that in becoming Jesus's disciples it was incumbent upon them to surrender private interests"; and Todt "The first Christian community was penetrated by the thought of the unity of interests. Each strove for all and all for each. In this striving they were communists as our socialists are today." But on the other hand Todt adds, "The New Testament represents human liberty and accepts any form of property-holding which fulfills this condition, whether it be private property in real estate or communal ownership in the socialist sense."

"On the other hand", says ~~Professor~~ Peabody, "New Testament critics of the first rank are practically agreed in recognizing that no real analogy exists between the modern situation and the early Christian practice" and he quotes Rogge, "The Koinonia of the first Christians is not an institution like the communism of the Essenes or Therapeutae, rather a condition marked, as Uhlhorn fittingly says, 'by absence of institution'; and Uhlhorn, "We might as well speak of a community of goods in a family... the thought with which we are dealing is not an institution of a community of goods"; and von Nathusius, "No one said of those things which were his own that they were his own; but it must be recognized that the basis of this moral duty lay in the right of private property;" and H. Holtzmann, "No compulsory abandonment of property relations or legally introduced communism is suggested. Of such an institution the Book of Acts speaks not a word"; and O. Holtzmann, "What the Book of Acts describes is free offerings of Christian brotherhood... Of any leveling of possessions or labor there is not a sign. No likeness is to be found between the conditions of the first Christian community and the program proposed by Socialism."

(Peabody, "Jesus Christ and the Social Question" - pg. 26 ff.)

The brotherly community of primitive Christianity was not an economic communism. It rested, on the other hand, on a clear recognition of the rights and duties of private property. (Acts II, 44; IV, 32) "They had all things common" are immediately followed and explained by the incident of Ananias and Peter's words, "While the land remained was it not thine own? And after it was sold was it not within thy right?"

The whole picture of the economic life of the early Church assumes unquestioningly the right of private property and Christian duties are ^{which} which find their meaning and possibility only in the recognition of this right. Note the ~~almshouses~~ of Dorcas, the possession of her home by Mary, the mother of Mark, ~~Unason's~~ ability to provide lodgings, the possession of property by the Hebrew Christians of which they would be despoiled (Heb. X, 34, XIII, 2, 5, 16), the exhortations to ~~alms giving~~ and to the ~~distinct~~ duties of rich and poor in the Epistles generally and the recommendation to the Corinthians in particular that every one should lay by on ~~the~~ the first day of the week as God had ~~profound~~ ^{prospered} him (I Cor. XVI, 2, Rom. XV, 26, I John III, 17).

It was in part because it recognized the institution of private property that the early Christian community was the living society that it was, in which opinion was free, and character and power and personality were trained in liberty and discipline. As Dr. R. E. Thompson wrote long ago in "The Divine Order of Human Society": "Take away the right of property. Establish all ownership in the state, and thus secure an absolute equality of social condition. By so doing, indeed, you will remove from society many of the worst temptations to wrong-doing. But you also will take away many of the greatest occasions of right-doing. You will have checked the flow of benevolence, abolished the demand for business integrity, and created a human type of limited moral experience and attenuated moral capacity. Human nature will have lost far more by the abolition of property than it will have gained by the elimination of the temptations that attend it.

"Furthermore, private property is essential to personal liberty. There is no freedom of speech or of action possible to members of communities in which it does not exist. In those societies in which the social development has been arrested before it reached this point, the community dominates the mind and conscience of the individual. Mrs. Grundy is omnipotent in the Russian mir, the Hindoo village community, the Indian tribe. He who will not submit to her becomes an outcast, is tabooed,--the most terrible form of boycott.

"It is only where every man can and most men do possess the means of self-support independently of the will of society, that any man can cherish and assert an opinion which is not shared by the community of which he is a member." (Pgs. 90-91)

Primitive Christianity used the institution of private property as a school of liberty and love.

(2) But what was the attitude of Christianity or the Church toward the excessive accumulation of private property, i. e. toward wealth or riches? The difficulty for us lies in the definition of "excessive". The man who has anything is rich to the man who has nothing, and the man who has more to the man who has less. The New Testament attempts no definition of riches, but from first to last it is full of warnings regarding them.

The teaching of Jesus was ~~manifestly~~ ^{plain} plain. 1. While he recognized the right of private property, and said nothing that makes possessions illegal, He perceived and pointed out the dangers of riches. "How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the Kingdom of God!" (Mark X: 23.) When the astonished disciples asked, "Who then can be saved?" He answered not by qualifying the peril of wealth, but by declaring that God was able even to save a rich man. The danger lay in the power of money to gather affection and to absorb trust, thus displacing God (Mark X: 24). So he warned men against its accumulation as a treasure on earth (Matt. VI: 19), and assured them that it was impossible to serve it and God also (Matt. VI: 24).

2. Another danger of riches, which conceals their true influence, is their deceitfulness (Matt. VI: 22). Men think they do not love money, or that they can serve both mammon and God; but Jesus declares that this is

the very evil of wealth, and that it is very hard for men with money to enter the kingdom (Luke ~~XVII~~: 24). Money is hardening in its influence also. It often makes men suspicious, checks their sympathies, and separates its holders from human need. The cases where it does not do this bring the other cases into sharper prominence. It is not strange that Jesus declared that the lot of the rich was woful (Luke ~~VI~~: 24), and the lot of the poor blessed in comparison (Luke ~~VII~~: 20). This was the keen lesson of the parable of ~~Dives~~ Dives and Lazarus (Luke ~~XVI~~: 19-31). In riches and poverty in themselves there is no moral quality. It is in their influence and inevitable tendency.

3. Jesus warned men against the restive desire to have more (Luke ~~XI~~: 13-15). "Take heed, and keep yourselves from all covetousness." The desire to be rich is useless, for a man's life does not consist in the things that he has (Luke ~~XI~~: 15). It is foolish, for these things cannot be taken with one. They are things, and not real possessions. A man will die from the very midst of them (Luke ~~XI~~: 16-20). Our real possessions are what go into our character or being, and so abide with us everlastingly. In enumerating in one place the sins of the inner life, Jesus set covetousness with thefts, wickedness, and deceit (Mark ~~VI~~: 22, cf. Rom. I: 29; I Cor. ~~VI~~: 10; Eph. ~~VI~~: 3, 5; Col. ~~III~~: 5; I Thess. ~~II~~: 5). In Heb. ~~XI~~: 5 the Greek word for covetousness is different from the word used elsewhere. It means not "the desire for money," but "the love of silver."

4. This evil effect of money Jesus bitterly experienced. The Pharisees loved money, and scoffed at Him and His teaching of singularity and fidelity (Luke ~~XVI~~: 14). Judas sold Him for money (Matt. ~~XVII~~: 14-16; Mark ~~XIV~~: 11).

5. Yet Jesus did not denounce money as iniquitous. He had a treasurer in His company (John ~~XI~~: 6; 13: 29). He spoke much of the necessity of recognizing money and our possessions as trusts from God (Matt. ~~XVII~~: 14-30; Luke ~~XI~~: 11-27). He sought for fidelity in men, whether with their abilities or with their material possessions. This was necessary to their being intrusted with more (Luke ~~XVI~~: 11).

6. After all, gold and silver were trifles. As ends they were beneath the contempt of Jesus. As means they were useful (John ~~XIII~~: 29), but there were more useful things. Jesus had no money of His own (Matt. ~~XVIII~~: 19; ~~XVII~~, 24-27). But who has done as much for the world as He has done? Spiritual wealth is worth more to its possessor and to the world than material wealth. The latter is necessary. In our modern society large capital is required for many things, and no wrong attaches to its honest accumulation. It is full of peril, however, to its possessor and to society (Luke ~~XVIII~~: 18-25). To heap it up is folly in the man who is not also rich towards God (Luke ~~XI~~: 21). And it is, after all, not true wealth (Luke ~~XVI~~: 11).

7. Two curses of wealth, as Jesus showed, are its tendency to distract trust from God to things (Matt. ~~VI~~: 19-34; Rev. ~~III~~: 17, 18), and its deprivation of its possessor of the privilege of sacrifice (Luke ~~XI~~: 1-4; Mark ~~XI~~: 41-44). They have wrong ambitions who haste to be rich. Agur was a man of wiser heart, and he prayed, "Give me neither poverty nor riches; feed me with food convenient for me." But do you know who Agur was, and where that prayer is recorded? Find that out, and, what is infinitely more than that, learn to compose your heart to trust the living God, who gives us richly all things to enjoy, and be rich in Him.

~~"The Principles of Jesus"~~ Pgs. 96-99.

There are two admirable studies of the attitude of Jesus toward property and wealth in Peabody's "Jesus Christ and the Social Question" and Cadoux's "The Early Church and the World."

"Jesus", says Cadoux, "recognized in a certain sense the need, utility, and rightfulness of personal property. He said, in regard to food and clothing, that 'your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things,' and promised his followers that, if they sought first the Kingdom and righteousness of God, 'all these things' would be added unto them. (Mt. VI. 32f). ~~The apostolic company kept a small store of money for the supply~~

Simon seems to have retained his house and belongings after he had been called to follow Jesus. (Matt. 16-18, 29; ff. I (with Swete MSS); Lc v, 1-11; J xxi. 3) The apostolic company kept a small store of money for the supply of necessaries. (Mc vi. 37/s; J iv. 8, xii, 6, xiii, 29). Joseph of Arimathaea was a disciple, and at the same time a rich man. (Mt xxvii, 57//s.) One of the women who followed Jesus and contributed to his support was the wife of Herod's steward or minister, and no doubt a person of considerable wealth. (Lc viii, 3). Jesus himself, up to the age of thirty, had worked for his livelihood as a builder, and his parables seem to show that he took a keen interest both in building and in agriculture. (Lc vi, 37//s; O. Holtzmann, Life of Jesus (ET), 100-103).

"At the same time, Jesus deprecates the pursuit and possession of wealth as dangerous and harmful, and that on several grounds."

The grounds enumerated by Cadoux were: first, the precarious terms on which all ~~mammia~~ material property is held (Matt. VI, 19 (Luke XII, 13-21)); secondly, wealth is dangerous because it tends to divert men from the interests of the Kingdom, (Mark X, 23-25) "Blessed are ye poor"; thirdly, wealth is dangerous because attachment to it tends to make men selfish and heartless toward the needy. (Luke XVI, 19 ff). On the other hand Jesus recognized service to be legitimately met by accumulated property, bodily needs of oneself and dependents (Matt. VI, 32 ff, VII, 9-11), the payment of taxes (Mark XII, 17), *alms* to the poor, the formation of friendships (Luke XVI, 8f) the expression of homage and worship (Mark XII, 41-44, Matt. XVII, 24-27, Mark XIV, 3-9) (Cadoux, "The Early Church and the World", pgs. 61-66).

And after a *searching* statement of Jesus' stern teachings about riches, Prof. Peabody concludes, Jesus "does not present a scheme of economic rearrangement; he issues a summons to the kingdom. He confronts a man, not with the problem of his commercial rights, but with the problem of his own soul. To many a man, ensnared in the complex and intense conditions of modern life, to many a man and woman tempted almost beyond their strength by self-indulgence, narrow interests, and practical materialism, the message of Jesus comes with convincing force. Such persons know well that it is hard for those who have riches to enter into the Kingdom. They know how difficult it is to maintain religious ideals, genuine simplicity, and breadth of sympathy among the exotic and artificial circumstances of a prosperous life. They see how frequently the possession of riches becomes a curse, and how often the children for whom the father has labored are but the worse for the abundance which he has secured, as though they had asked him for bread and he had given them a stone. They have to confess that it is easier for the poor than for the rich to be poor in spirit. Such persons, however, when they look once more at the world of modern life, observe that the stern demand of Jesus is sometimes met; that--here and there--riches are deliberately and consistently held as a trust from God, and the way of service is made broad and straight through the ministry of wealth; and they recognize the wisdom of Jesus, when, having said so unreservedly, 'How hardly shall they that have riches enter into the kingdom of God!' (Luke xviii, 24) he is still able to say of the man who had faithfully used his many talents, 'Blessed is that servant, ... Of a truth I say unto you, that he will set him over all that he hath.'" (Luke xii, 43, 44).

And there are three legitimate uses of wealth: its use in charity, its *esthetic* use in ministry to happiness and beauty, and its scrupulous and honorable use in that *special* work which one is called upon to do. (Idem. pp. 216-223) Jesus' view may be summarized in His parable of the Talents (Matt. XXV, 14-30) and in His words in the stronger Parable of the Unjust Steward, "I say unto you, Make to yourselves friends by means of the mammon of unrighteousness; that, when it shall fail, they may receive you into the eternal tabernacles. He that is faithful in a very little is faithful also in much: and he that is unrighteous in a very little is unrighteous also in much. If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches? And if ye have not been faithful in that which is another's, who will give you that which is your own?" (Luke XVI, 9-12).

(3) While aware of the dangers of wealth the early Church rejoiced in the hospitality and charity which it made possible (~~Rom. XII, 13, XV 25-27, XVI, 23, I Tim. I, 8, III, 2; I Peter IV, 9; James II, 15, 16; I Jno. III, 17;~~) and inculcated the duty of frugality and thrift. It required its members to work and insisted on just wages. (~~I Cor. XVI, 2, Luke X, 7; James V, 4, I Tim. V, 18; II Tim. II, 6; II Thessa, III, 10~~). In a word the primitive church was a community of industry, of simplicity, of thrift, of mutual helpfulness, of frugality and love. Its economics were the law of liberty and brotherhood.

B. The position of woman and marriage and divorce.

On no subject did early Christianity speak more clearly or with more revolutionary effect than on the family, on the place of woman and on marriage and divorce. The Gospel introduced a new attitude toward woman, Plato represents a state as wholly disorganized where slaves are disobedient to their masters and wives are on an equality with their husbands. Aristotle characterizes women as being of a lower kind, declaring "both a woman and a slave may be good, though perhaps of these the one is less good, and the other is wholly bad." Socrates asks of his friends, "Is there a human being with whom you talk less than with your wife?" Other religions have slurred woman. It was given to Buddha in his candidacy for the buddhaship that he should never in the great wheel of transmigration be born in hell or as vermin or as a woman. Mohammed's example is an odorous illustration of the influence of Mohammedanism. "A Voice from a Harem," in the Nineteenth Century Magazine, August, 1890, cries, "The Duty that man owes to his fellow-creature is hardly ever mentioned in our religion." "The very heaven of the Koran is a paradise conditioned on the eternal degradation of womanhood." The code of Manu, the highest religious authority among Hindus, says, "Women have no business with the text of a sacred book." A Brahman is to "suspend reading the Veda if a woman come in sight." "Though unobservant of approved usages," it declares, "or enamoured of another woman, or devoid of good qualities, yet a husband must constantly be revered as a god by a virtuous wife."

~~"The Man Christ Jesus" Pg. 136f.~~

Let us begin with Jesus' views on ~~these~~ these subjects of marriage, the family and the place of woman, which He expressed without reservation. This is worthy of note, for, as Professor Peabody points out, "this is the only aspect of social life concerning which Jesus descended from the announcing of general principles to the further duty of prescribing specific legislation." In the matter of the political problems of the day Jesus dealt in general principles. He was not afraid (Luke 13: 32), but "it was Christ's fixed resolution," says Professor Seeley, "to enter into no contest with the civil power." Accordingly He refused to speak in great detail of civil duties. But on the question of the marriage relation Jesus spoke fearlessly and unqualifiedly. He welcomed the questions of Pharisees (Matt. 19: 3) and Sadducees (Matt. 22: 23) on the subject and answered them "with such force and clearness that 'when the multitudes heard it, they were astonished at His teaching'" (Matt. 22: 33).

1. Jesus did not teach that it was the duty of all to marry. He Himself never did so. Some men were not intended to marry, He taught, "physical reasons of temperament or of heredity" fitly prohibiting it. In other cases men may be called to sacrifice the privilege of the married life for the sake of service which will not permit it (Matt. 19: 12). Was not this the case with Paul?

2. But, when men did marry, Jesus taught that they entered into a real union of life. "For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother and shall cleave to his wife, and the twain shall become one flesh" (Matt. 19: 5, 6). The word "flesh, in Hebrew thought," says Professor Bruce, "represents the entire man, and the ideal unity of marriage covers the whole nature. It is a unity of soul as well as of body; of sympathy, interest, purpose." Most assuredly it is this or it is mere bestiality. In a true union the natures merge and interpenetrate.

"As saffron tingeth flesh, blood, bones, and all."

What the Christian ~~man~~ view is may be seen in Eph. 5: 25-33. Paul admits

that the mystery is great, but it is glorious.

3. This union was in its principle and possibility so vital that Jesus said it could not be broken. "Whosoever shall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery against her" (Mark 10; 11). That is Christ's absolute prohibition of divorce. He had taken up this subject in the Sermon on the Mount, declaring this same doctrine with one qualification (Matt. 5: 22). Men may not like this doctrine; they may call it terrible; civil laws may allow divorce for many causes; but this is Jesus' view. He regarded marriage as an indissoluble union.

4. Jesus' doctrine of marriage obliterates every pretext for polygamy. One husband belongs to one wife. Even a look or longing cast on another woman by a man Jesus denounced as adultery committed already in his heart (Matt. 5: 27-30). A son could as well have two mothers as a husband two wives in Jesus' view. The relationship is of the same vital, organic kind (Matt. 19: 4-8). ~~The arguments by which some scholars have attempted to prove the toleration of polygamy in the early Church have annulled themselves by proving on the same principles of interpretation the existence of polyandry.~~ (2 Tim. 2: 14)

5. Jesus' view of marriage contemplated it, not as an indulgence, but as a discipline. There are some people who rebel at this, and will not attempt to learn its lessons of considerateness and forgiveness so long as "it is easier to be divorced than to be good." But love in marriage and out of it is an exercise, not of caprice, but of the will.

6. We cannot believe that Jesus' doctrine of marriage limited it to the physical life. Such union of soul as well as body must survive the death of the body. Jesus' words in Matt. 22: 30 and Luke 20: 34-36 do not imply "the abolition of all the higher spiritual qualities" of a union of life here. If character is eternal, this living coalescing of character must be also. We have a right to prefer Browning's interpretation of Jesus' words:

"Marriage on earth seems such a counterfeit,
 Mere imitation of the inimitable;
 In heaven we have the real and true and sure;
 'Tis there they neither marry nor are given
 In marriage, but are as the angels; right,
 O how right that is, how like Jesus Christ
 To say that! Marriage making for the earth,
 With gold so much, --birth, power, repute so much,
 Or beauty, youth so much, in lack of these!
 Be as the angels, rather, who, apart,
 Know themselves into one, are found at length
 Married, but marry never, no, nor give,
 In marriage; they are man and wife at once
 When the true time is; here we have to wait.
 Not so long, neither!"

If As to the home.

¶ Jesus' view of marriage was of course vitally related to His view of the family. He was a member of a race in which the family had been a great institution, and Jesus made a yet nobler place for it in His Church. "His entire theology may be described as a transfiguration of the family. God is a Father, man is His child; and from the Father to the child there is conveyed the precious message of paternal love."

1. Here, then, in what Jesus showed of the Father's heart in God, and in the loving home life He revealed in the Godhead, is a great sanction of the family life. He ever spoke to God and of God as Father in a real filial way (John 2: 16; 5: 17; 10: 15, 17; 11: 41; 12: 27, 28). He gave His disciples glimpses of the intimacy of their relationship as Father and Son (John 5: 35; 5: 20, 26; 6: 57; 8: 28, 38; 17: 5). Like a human child He said He followed His Father's ways as He had seen them (John 5: 19). He spoke to them of heaven as His Father's house (John 14: 2). Every family in heaven and earth takes name and beauty from His divine fatherhood (Eph. 3: 15).

2. Jesus was constantly lending the support of His favor to family love (Luke 9: 42), and the social life of men. He went with His disciples to a wedding (John 2: 1-11). He responded to appeals based on paternal love (John 4: 49), on motherly anxiety (Luke 7: 11-15). He took thought for the feelings of parents always (Luke 8: 51). He represented the first impulse of the prodigal when he came to himself as a longing for home, "I will arise and go to my father," and He drew a picture of the eager, forgiving love of the father's heart (Luke 15: 18). Though homeless Himself for much of His public life (Luke 9: 58), He never depreciated the importance or propriety of home life, and He found rest during the last week in the family circle at Bethany, while with almost His last breath on the cross He made provision for His mother, "And that disciple took her unto his own ~~home~~ home" (John 19: 27; 20: 10). He believed in homes, though He was a homeless man (Mark 5: 19). He said that the shepherd went out for his sheep and brought it home, where he called in his neighbors to rejoice (Luke 15: 6). In all these ways Jesus showed His approval of our home life, and, as Dr. R. E. Thompson says, "His elevation of patience and forgiveness to the rank of primary virtues in the kingdom gave a new law of life to the Christian household."

3. Though Jesus' work later led Him out to be a wanderer, He grew up in a Jewish home, one of the best types of the homes of the godly poor. He was indeed taunted with the poverty of His home and the lowliness of His surroundings (Matt. 13: 55; John 7: 48-52; I: 46). He never said a word in recognition of such sneers. They were beneath contempt. And, though Joseph was not His father, there is no evidence that He ever said so or ~~tried~~ to escape from the relations in which in the eyes of the world His life had been set. In the home He was all that a child should be (Luke 2: 40, 51, ~~52~~ 52). But His conduct there showed that there are two limits to a son's obedience. Jesus set His Father's business above His parents' authority (Luke 2: 48, 49), and His duty to God above His responsibility to His mother (Mark 3: 20, 21, 31-35).

It must have been terrible to Jesus to think of this, and it is significant that He chose the rupture of family relationships as the most dreadful illustration of what havoc would be wrought by men's refusal to receive Him and in Him the solidifying and ennobling of all true human relationships (Matt. 10: 36).

4. Love in the home was necessary to love out of the home. John presses this truth remorselessly in his Epistle (I John 2: 9; 3: 14; 4: 20, 21). How full Jesus' teaching is of appeals to love and perfect confidence in the family! (Matt. 5: 22, 24; 7: 3-5; 18: 15, 21, 35; Luke 12: 13; 17: 3). ~~"It is useless," says the author of Ecce Homo, "to tell a man to love all mankind if he never loved any individual of mankind, and only knows by report what love is. It should be recognized that family affection in some form is the almost indispensable root of Christianity."~~

5. Jesus had His own family sorrow (John 7: 5). But it turned in the end to a joy (I Cor. 9: 5). And what He and His brethren lost for a little while was our gain. It brought forth the assurance of a new and blessed family relationship in which each of us may be to Christ what His own family failed to be to Him (Mark 3: 35).

In interpreting the gospel to the world Paul said that in it there was neither male nor female. Privilege was common, and no line of distinction separated the sexes as participants in the grace of God. And Paul correctly interpreted Christ in this. He never suggested or recognized any inferiority of woman. He constantly assumed her equality.

(As to women) 1. ~~Jesus~~ treated women as He treated men. He talked with them (John 4: 27; Luke 10: 38). Not to speak of the position of a woman elsewhere, among the Jews talking with a woman was contrary to the custom of the doctors. They declared that it was "better that the words of the law should be burned than delivered to women." But Jesus made them His friends (Luke 10: 38; John 11: 5). He answered their questions (John 4: 9-11), and exclamations (Luke 11: 27), and sympathy (Luke 23: 28). "He gave scope for woman's powers in His every command." He healed women (Luke 8: 2); He praised their faith (Matt. 15: 28); and He included them in the beneficence of His loving thought

and provision (Matt. 15: 38).

2. The teaching of Jesus, as Paul said, was so broadly and really human that divisions of sex disappear in it (Gal. 3: 28). Jesus simply taught the truth to human hearts, and it vindicated itself as the truth in revealing the unity of our hearts. "Christ raised woman to her rightful place ~~as~~ man's equal, not by decreasing ~~her~~ that her subjection should cease, but by declaring God to men in His true character, and by making our relation to God one of affection as well as of love.... He presented the gospel as at once so masculine in its strength and so feminine in its tenderness that the equality of the two sexes in the highest matters must be recognized at once, and woman's worth in all lesser would obtain recognition ~~sooner~~ sooner or later." Pick out at random any ten commands of Christ, and see whether they do not apply equally to men and women, and assume their equality.

3. Jesus was most tender and kind to women. He constantly helped them in need (Luke 13: 11). He invariably spoke generously of them, and never used a woman as illustrative of other than noble qualities (Luke 18: 1-8). How often did He use men as illustrative of qualities that were not noble? He commended a woman's loving service of God (Luke 21: 1-4); praised one woman's lavish display of affection (Mark 14: 3); and another's simple-hearted trust and kindness (Luke 7: 37-50); and lifted another's thought above her household cares (John II: 21-27).

4. Women answered Jesus' noble treatment of them (Mark 14: 3; Luke 7: 36-50). They followed Him (Luke 23: 49). They ministered to Him of their substance (Luke 8: 2,3). No woman said unkind words about Him; none betrayed or denied Him (Luke II: 27; 23: 27). They stood last at His cross (John 19: 25; Luke 23: 49). They came first to His sepulchre (Luke 23: 55; 24: 1), and they were the first witnesses of the resurrection (John 20: 1-17), and His first heralds (John 20: 18; Luke 24: 10). "The only bad women of the gospel story," says Dr. R. E. Thompson, "are the two who never came within the touch of His influence, Herodias and her daughter." Make a list of all the women of the Gospels, and think of their relation to Jesus.

5. Jesus did not regard woman as under a different code of morals from man. Sin that men pardon in a man and condemn in a woman, Jesus condemned in man and woman. He dealt with sinful women. He never dealt with them in derogation of the highest moral standards. He forgave sin, but He did not condone it. His call for purity bound all to holiness (John 8: 1-11).

6. The teaching and example of Jesus were as far removed from a weak indulgence as from a hard tyranny in this matter. He did not recognize that woman as woman has a right to be silly and selfish, any more than He recognized that man as man has a right to be domineering and superior. The ideal of the Beatitudes fits both, and both are under the law of service as disciples of Him who came not to be ministered unto, but to minister (Mark 10: 45).

The Principles of Jesus" - Pgs. 76 - 87.

There is no evidence of the existence of polygamy in the New Testament Church. There are scores of passages which embody the unquestioning assumption of monogamy, and the only verses which some have deemed capable of a different construction are I Tim. iii, 2, 12, and Titus i, 6. But if these verses imply the existence and toleration of polygamy, then I Tim. v, 9 implies the existence and toleration of polyandry. No; marriage, as conceived in the New Testament, is of one man to one woman. And it is conceived as a permanent life relation. ~~This is Christ's teaching, Matt. xix, 4-6: "And he answered and said, Have ye not read, that he who made them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder."~~ This view is what I Tim. iii, 2, and Titus i, 6 prove that Paul taught in the case of the husband, and Rom. vii, 2 and I Cor. vii, 39 unequivocally assert it in the case of the wife, while I Cor. vii, 2-4 asserts it for both. Husband and wife are bound together in the deepest unity. Paul speaks of them as forming only one body, not physically ^{only} (as Jesus says), but in the deepest mystical sense, as loving one ^{another}

all divorce being forbidden or forbidden in the case of infidelity alone

with a complete and unselfish love, "even as Christ also loved the Church." "Even so ought husbands also to love their own wives as their own bodies. ~~He that loveth his own wife but nourisheth and cherisheth it, even as Christ also the church; because we are members of his body. For this cause shall a man leave his father and his mother and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh. This mystery is great; but I speak in regard of Christ and of the church. Nevertheless, do ye also severally love each one his own wife even as himself" (Eph. v, 28-33). There are many expressions of this lofty Christian ideal of marriage in the New Testament: Col. iii, 18, 19; Titus ii, 4, 5; I Peter iii, 1-7; Eph. v, 23. And the use of the marriage ideal in the passage in Ephesians, to express the relationship of Christ to His Church, raises marriage to the level of the highest and holiest thought possible to man. (See also Rev. xix, 7, 9; xxi, 9).~~

Can the marriage relationship be dissolved except by death? There are those who hold that not even death dissolves it, and who find a confirmation of their view in our Lord's words in Matt. xxi, 30, and in Paul's use of marriage as the symbol of Christ's union with His Church. But the teaching of Rom. vii, 2, 3, and I Cor. vii, 39 is explicit that on the death of the husband, and only then, the wife is free to remarry, and presumably the same reasoning holds in the case of the death of the wife. ~~Some Living Issues~~ ~~from~~ ~~the~~ ~~Journal~~ ~~of~~ ~~the~~ ~~Evangelical~~ ~~Church~~ ~~of~~ ~~America~~ ~~-~~ ~~Pgs.~~ ~~168~~ ~~1~~.

As to divorce the words of our Lord in Luke XVI, 18 and Mark X, 2-12 are clear and unequivocal: and "Every one that putteth away his wife and marrieth another committeth adultery and he that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery." Jesus's words in Matt. V, 31, 32 and XIX, 3-12, however, allow divorce for the one cause of fornication. These passages in Matthew, however, are not without difficulty. First of all there are textual difficulties as to Matt. xix, 9. Some ancient authorities, as the American Revised Version margin indicates, omit the last clause of the verse and others give a different rendering for the words "committeth adultery," which they render, in conformity with Matt. v, 32, "maketh her an adulteress." The latter translation also presents difficulty of interpretation. Secondly, there are different constructions of the significance of "put away" and of "fornication" and "adultery."

Certainly the utmost that the passages in Matthew require or allow is the single modification of the teaching as given in Luke and Mark, namely, that the marriage relationship may be dissolved by unfaithfulness: as some hold, by unfaithfulness prior to marriage but only discovered afterwards (fornication), and others, by unfaithfulness after marriage (adultery). It would seem from all the passages that the latter is the only clearly recognized ground for divorce, but at the most, certainly, there is no cause recognized other than these two. ~~Some Living Issues~~ - Pg. 172.

It is held by some that Paul in I Cor. VII, 10-17, allowed divorce on other grounds than adultery. But a careful study of his words combined with the words of Jesus would seem to indicate that the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church were:

- (1) There there can be no divorce except for adultery.
- (2) That separation (not including divorce) is deprecated but recognized, although only in the case of the wife (but should she depart, let her remain unmarried, or else be reconciled to her husband; ~~see~~ I Cor. vii, 11) or where one of the two partners is an unbeliever, and then only on the part of the unbeliever. This is all that Paul's words specifically cover with regard to the Corinthian Church. Moreover, he specifically disapproves the union, in the first place, of believers with unbelievers (II Cor. vi, 14, 15). There is not a word in the New Testament which justifies or approves the separation of believers, or their divorce on the ground of separation or desertion or any other ground whatever, except adultery.
- (3). That the Church may not remarry persons who have separated but who have not been divorced for adultery; such persons are still married according to the Christian law, and remarriage would be bigamy. ~~Some Living Issues~~ - Pg. 174.

It is clear from ~~one~~ ^{our} study of "The Church in the House" that women occupied a *unique* place in the life and work of the early Church. Paul's references to their subordination in I Cor. XI, 3-9, XIV, 34, 35 and I Tim. II, 11-14, Eph. V, 23, 24 are all readily explicable without conflict with ~~his~~ ^{his} great principle ~~and~~ which was evidently embodied in the practice of Christianity, that in Christ there is neither male nor female, (Gal. III, 28) and that husbands are to love their wives as Christ loved the Church. How much did Christ love the Church? Paul answers in Phil. II, 5-7. ~~enough to give up his form for us~~

Primitive Christianity rested on the principle of human equality. This was the rich note of Church life in the New Testament. Miss Royden has emphasized this. While the religions of the world have painstakingly defined the status of women, "Christianity alone has complimented them by ignoring them as women. Christ laid down no rules for women as separate from men. He talked with men and women alike; His teaching for one is teaching for the other. Compare, or rather contrast, the teachings of other great founders of religion. Everywhere you will find special teaching about women. Sometimes the teaching is of a very lofty order, and can be quoted with pride by those to whom the raising of the condition of women is dear. Sometimes it is base and unworthy. But always there is some special teaching about the virtues, the ideals and the sphere of women. Only in the religion of Christ is this special teaching entirely absent. Only with Him do we find that virtue is one and to be arrived at by both sexes, by the whole human race; only in Him is there no suggestion that courage, independence, self-reliance and wisdom are to be special ideals of men, while obedience, submission, subordination, patience, and the like are virtues to be required of women... No wonder the response of women to the teaching of Christ was quick and universal. No special teaching that could have been given in terms, however reverent and noble, could have had so liberating, so far-reaching, so revolutionary an effect as this serene and deliberate ignoring of any fundamental differences in the quality of the humanity of those to whom Christ spoke." - "Some Living Issues" - Pg. 194f.

(Footnote - For a fuller discussion of these matters see "Some Living Issues" Ch. "Marriage & Divorce" and Ch. "The Equality of Women").

It was on these ideals of woman and marriage that the Christian conception of the family rested - and out of them grew the most beneficent of all the institutions of society, the Christian home.

III. Slavery.

Primitive Christianity did not at once abolish the institution of slavery. The word does not, indeed, occur in our English Bible and the word "Slave" is found only in Rev. XVIII, 13. But the Greek word *oulos*, which is the word for slave, occurs again and again, sometimes as sublimated into a term for discipleship or absolute surrender to the mastership of Christ, but often in the social and economic sense as a bondman or human slave (5 Cor. VII, 21, XII, 13, Gal. III, 28, Eph. VI, 8, Col. III, 11 etc. etc.).

But while recognizing the social and economic status Christianity abolished the human distinction. In Christ, it declared, there was neither bond nor free. This, as Cadoux points out, was the cardinal point, "that from the spiritual point of view of the Church, the distinction between ~~slave~~ slave and free, like that between male and female, Jew and *Hellenes*, had no validity whatever. On either side of this *Centre* Christian feeling shapes itself in opposite directions. On the one hand slavery is felt to be to this extent an *evil*, that Paul advises a slave who has the chance of securing his emancipation to take it (I Cor. VII, 21) and gives Philemon a fairly straight hint that he ought to emancipate *Onesimus*, and a number of metaphorical expressions are used which *presuppose* or imply a *degradation* of the slave's condition. (Gal. IV, 1, 3, 7-9, 24f; V. 1; I Cor. VII, 15, Rev. VI, 6; VIII, 13, 21; IX, 12. Titus II, 3; III, 3). On the other hand *servitude* is not so great an *evil* but that the slave may be encouraged to remain patiently where he is (I Cor. VII, 20, 24). And not only do we find slavery often used as an illustration of much that was essential and invaluable in Christian thought and practice, but we are enabled to see how Christianity was specially adapted to impart a moral dignity to the slaves *lot* and to foster the virtues for which that lot was the peculiar field."

(Cadoux, "The Early Church and the World" Pg. 133f.) Nevertheless the relationship of master and slave in the Church was to be held in complete subjection to the law of brotherhood and equality and in due time that law in its outworking in the Church and in human society abolished slavery.

IV. War.

No aspect of primitive Christianity is of more interest to us today than its attitude toward war. *(Love is the very antithesis of the mind of Christ.)* It would seem to be as clear as day that in a world wholly governed by the principles of Jesus there would be no war. But there was and is no such world and the question is as to the mind of Christ and the attitude of the early Church in the ~~actual~~ actual world with which they had to deal.

Many arguments in defense of war may be at once set aside, such as the failure of Jesus to condemn it or His failure to require soldiers who believed in Him to abandon the profession. The same style of argument would support slavery. Jesus did not condemn that or require masters to release their slaves. On the other hand, some objections to war may be set aside with equal brevity; such as that war is forbidden by the commandment, "Thou shalt not kill," when other provisions of the same law command the killing of men for certain offenses, or that Jesus is called "Prince of Peace," when elsewhere the imagery of war is constantly used, "In righteousness He doth judge and make war."

It is true, as the Friends maintain, that Jesus came "to inculcate such principles of conduct and to establish such relations between God and men that unbrotherly conduct should cease"; but to contend further, as some do, that "His words in Matt. V: 38-48 lay down a principle of love to all and violence to none, whether fellow-countrymen or foreigner, which leaves no place for war," is to adopt the principle upon which the communist finds in Jesus' teaching a denial of the rights of private property; the antinomian, the abrogation of moral law; and the believer in "divine healing," the assertion of the abolition of disease. Jesus does enjoin brotherly love and long-suffering, but He does not thereby mean to secure to injustice a perfectly free field when it has power to work its will. The position of some opponents of war reduces itself to this, that bad men may resist bad men, but good men may not, Jesus did not teach this view.

~~"War," as Captain Mahan says, "is the employment of force for the attainment of an object or for the prevention of an injury." If the object be wrong, of course the employment of force is wrong. But is it wrong if the object be right? If so, in what does the wrong consist? in the use of physical force, or in the death of men consequent thereon? There is nothing intrinsically wrong in the former. All work is done in this way. God is resisting men thus constantly. Jesus silenced tempests and restrained wild men, and Paul "fought with wild beasts." The fact that God Manages physical ~~forces~~ *forces* by His will does not alter the fact that He does wrong if it is intrinsically wrong to accomplish ends with force. Does the wrong consist in the deaths that follow in the train of war? God Himself is constantly taking human life, and He has authorized man to take life. No, war cannot be wrong because it uses force or results in death.~~

War as war is not unjustifiable in our world. It would be if waged for selfish ends, but in Jesus' words, "Resist not evil," there is no warrant ~~for~~ *wrong* for a man, as Captain Mahan says, "to surrender the rights of another, still less if he is the trustee of those rights. This applies with double ~~emphasis~~ emphasis to rulers and to nations; for these, in this matter, have no personal rights. They are guardians, trustees, and as such are bound to do their best, even to the use of force, if need be, for the rightful interest of their wards. Personally, I go farther, and maintain that the possession of power is a talent committed in trust, for which account will be exacted; and that, under some circumstances, an obligation to repress evil external to its borders rests upon a nation as responsibility for the slums rests upon the rich quarters of a city. In this respect I call to witness Armenia, Crete, and Cuba, without, however, presuming to judge the consciences of the nations who witnessed without intervention the sufferings of the first two."

It is true that Jesus said, "Put up again thy sword into its place" (Matt. 26: 52); "They that take the sword shall perish with the sword" (Matt. 26: 52); "My kingdom is not of this world; if My kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight" (John 18: 36). But He was submitting Himself to death for the good of man and the salvation of the world. Where our death will secure great ends we must be willing to die gladly; but ~~where~~ our death or acts of injustice against us secure no good end, injure those who commit them, and involve innocent sufferers whose interests are ~~we~~ held in trust, we are not justified in taking the easy course of tame submission. Moreover, Jesus told His disciples at the end to take, as they ~~went~~ went forth, the full equipment of a traveller in a hostile country,--wallet, purse, and sword. Were they to use the wallet and purse, and carry the sword merely for amusement? or was it to be for intimidation? If the latter does not the right to equip for war imply the right to go to war?

But the main question is this: Is non-interference with wrong or resistance thereto more Christian? The use of force and the consequence thereof are minor questions. The Christian Church in the first century was not called, and never as a Church has been called, to go to war; but nations and ordered governments, whether then or now, are to do justice and to prevent wrong. Paul said this was the divine purpose of government in the case of Rome (Rom. 13: 4). It is not possible that God should intend a heathen government to prevent evil, but Christian governments to permit it. - ~~The Principles of Jesus~~ - Pgs. 119-122.

It is true that in ~~his~~ ^{Jesus'} reference to the Old Testament ~~history~~ there is no condemnation of the wars of Israel, and in His ~~prophecies~~ ^{prophecies} of the Last Things Jesus predicts future wars as God's judgment on Judea and Jerusalem "as a result of the national rejection of Jesus' own policy of goodwill, endurance and reconciliation...The thought of God punishing the Jews as a nation by means of the terrors of war, and that through the instrumentality of the Roman armies, raises a number of acute theological problems. How, for instance, is this teaching to be related to that picture of the Divine perfection, in which God is portrayed as showering the blessings of Nature upon good and evil alike? Upon this theological question it is not possible here to enter. It is sufficient for the moment to remark that, whatever may be the prima facie grounds for regarding as permissible all human action ~~that~~ that is an imitation of Divine action, Jesus does as a matter of fact limit his counsels of imitation to the gentler side of Divine action, and never, even remotely, contemplates a disciple of His own acting as the instrument of God's punitive justice." (Cadoux "The Early Church and the World" - pg. 54).

Christianity may not employ war for the ~~purposes~~ ^{purposes} of the Gospel. This is clear as daylight. But it is equally clear that Jesus did not teach the relaxation of restraint on crime and the prohibition of the use of legitimate authority.

If this is a true account of the matter in the Gospels, what does the rest of the New Testament show to have been the actual attitude of the ~~Church~~ Church. Cadoux summarizes it. "The Christian, and particularly the Jewish Christian, regarding the history recorded in the sacred Scriptures as Divinely controlled, could look back upon Israelitish wars not only with complacence, but with a devout admiration, totally unconscious of any problem presented by their horrors. Stephen and Paul both recalled with a glow of patriotic enthusiasm how God had subdued and destroyed the Canaanites before their ancestors under Joshua. (Ac vii. 45, xiii, 19). The author of Hebrews reminds his readers how "by faith the walls of Jericho fell down, ...by faith Rahab the harlot did not perish with the disobedient, because she had received the spies in peace": and he mentions in his catalogue of the heroes of faith "Gideon, Barak, Samson, Jephthah, David, Samuel, and the prophets, who by means of faith subdued kingdoms...escaped the edge of the sword, became strong in war, routed armies of foreigners." (H xi. 30-34; cf. vii. 1) ("~~Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings~~"). (It is possible that in iv. 8 we get the starting-point of that thought of Joshua as an early type of Christ, which the name 'Inceus common to both inevitably suggested). Whatever was recorded and approved by an Old Testament

author was not regarded as a fitting subject for Christian criticism. There was then no historical sense with which to discern development in man's knowledge of God's Will; and the Christian mind thus lacked, not only the inclination, but also the means, of properly comparing the ethic of their own faith with that of a long distant foretime. They were saved by the soundness of their own moral intuitions from drawing from these ancient precedents the erroneous conclusions affecting their own conduct which some modern controversialists are so eager to draw for them. The warlike habits of their ancestors and their own peaceful principles formed two separate realms, both of which they recognized, without attempting to harmonize them." stFootnote: B. Baker (ICW 3, 16) justly points out the approbation with which the exploits of Hebrew warriors are spoken of in Hebrew. But he ignores that immaturity of Christian thought of which we have just spoken, and the fact that the approbation is in any case only a relative one. His conclusion that war is sanctioned and permitted to Christians by the teaching of the early disciples is vitiated by this serious oversight. Christians did not think of blaming Rahab for being a prostitute (Jud. xi. 31: cf. Jer. li. 25), or Abraham for having a concubine (Gen. iv. 22): but that did not mean that prostitution and concubinage were permissible to Christians.)" (Cadoux - "The Early Church and the World" - ~~page 117f.~~ pg. 117f.)

St. Paul's Epistles are full of military metaphors and similes used in illustration of different aspects of Christian life. ^{But}"While we find much in the literature of the time which clearly implies the incompatibility of the Christian life with bloodshed in any form or in any cause, and while we have no record of any Christian of the time entering, either voluntarily or otherwise, upon military life after his conversion, we have no evidence to show that leading and representative Christians felt the incongruity so clearly as to suggest that a soldier, if he were converted, ought to leave the service." (Cadoux "The Early Church and the World" - pg. 119)

"The Christian attitude to soldiers who were not Christians presents a mixture of disapprobation and respect. Most of the sufferings that befell Christians in the form of State-persecution were inflicted by the hands of soldiers." ~~Footnote - On soldiers as the normal executioners, Schuren i.~~

"The Christian attitude to the few soldiers who are recorded to have 'believed' or been baptized during this period exhibits--so far as our admittedly scanty records tell us--no consciousness that their profession was incompatible with their newly adopted faith." ~~(Footnote - Bigelmair 166: 'Keiner von allen erhält die Mahnung, seine Stellung zu verlassen, ihr Beruf findet überhaupt keine weitere Erörterung, wie denn überhaupt die heiligen Schrift sich mit irdischen Berufsfragen wenig beschäftigt.')~~" (Cadoux - "The Early Church and the World" - Pg. 121).

Cadoux's conclusion with regard to the period prior to 110 A. D. is that "we have practically no direct evidence whereby to test the state of Christian feeling at this time on the question as to how far, if at all, it was regarded as legitimate for a Christian to be a soldier. We can only say (1) that no Christian writing up to the end of our period contains any explicit statement to the effect that it was wrong for a Christian to be a soldier; (2) that these writings, besides containing complimentary allusions to various military men, record how one or two such men were actually admitted to the Christian Church by baptism without being asked (as far as we know) to resign their military calling: ~~(Footnote: See above, pp. 114f~~

~~ist schwerlich erheblich").~~ (It is unreasonable to treat this laissez-faire attitude on the part of early Christians and New Testament writers towards the military calling ~~(as e.g., Prof. B. Baker does - ICW 16f)~~ as if it represented the considered judgment of the Church on what was recognized later on to be a difficult and acute problem. It was rather the attitude of those ~~wh~~ who had not yet realized that there was a problem to be solved. It is inadequate as an index even to the convictions and practice of the apostolic age, and still more so as a basis for modern Christian ethics.) (3) that, after the conversion of the Philippian gaoler, there is no undoubted reference to any Christian soldier for a hundred and twenty years: ~~(Footnote: For~~

We shall probably not be far from the truth in concluding that for the majority of Christians nothing had ~~occurred~~ occurred to bring the military problem before their minds; (Weinel Th. 639f), hence the few cases of soldiers being converted raised little difficulty. No Christian, on the other hand, would voluntarily become a soldier after conversion. ~~This~~ ^{(this} is Harnack's conclusion) (MC 48); he would be deterred from doing so, not only by fear of contamination from idolatry, but also by a natural reluctance--and doubtless in many cases by a conscientious objection--to using arms." (Cadoux - Pg. 189f)

The problem of war had simply ^{not} presented itself to the mind of the early Church, as in the case also of slavery, but ^{all} that that church believed was clearly opposed in principle to both. It had one ideal for humanity. That

was the Kingdom of God, which is righteousness and peace and joy.

V. The Christian's relation to the State.

The New Testament presents no ^{more perplexing} problem to our modern minds than this problem of the relation of Christians to the State, inasmuch as we are wholly unable to view the question as it existed in the primitive Church. We cannot reproduce the world in which the early Christians thought and lived. And we ^{inevitably} read back into that world and into the primitive Christian mind the conditions and ideas of our own times.

Our Lord and most of the early Christians were subjects but they were not citizens and did not have the privileges or duties of citizens of the Roman Empire which was the State under which they lived. Today the members of the Church are also citizens of the State and the character of the State is wholly ^{different} for us in ^{America} from the Roman State. The modern

^{American} Christian ^{has} two sets of principles and obligations and his problem is both simpler and more complex than that of the ^{past} Christians.

Jesus Himself "was brought into contact, not with one government but with three, and those all markedly differed from one another--the governments namely of Herodes Antipas, of the Roman Empire, and of the Jews themselves. The last of these again, presented certain special ~~features~~ features, being an administration at once ecclesiastical and civil, and wearing the dual aspect natural to a polity founded on the Mosaic Law. (~~Montefiore SG i. lxx.~~) His expressions naturally vary according as he has in mind one or other of them: we can detect, for instance, a special deference to the Jewish administration on the ground of its Mosaic origin, a special severity to Herodes on the ground of his personal character, and a special longing that his fellow-countrymen as a whole should, by patience and generosity and love, seek reconciliation with the Romans rather than provoke them to more grievous oppression by a patriotic and vengeful ill-will.

"There can be no doubt that Renan was wrong when he represented Jesus as regarding civil government as simply an abuse. (~~Footnote - Renan Vie de Jesus (vii.) 131 (ed. 1884): "Jesus, a quelques egards, est un anarchiste, car il n'a aucune idee du gouvernement civil. ce gouvernement lui semble purement et simplement un abus."~~) On the other hand, it must remain doubtful whether He ever committed Himself to the later Pauline view of the imperial authorities as being appointed by God. (~~Footnote - The only passage~~ ~~Mark 1925, 187-199, and see below, p. 48.)~~ But, so far as we are able to ^{gather}, his attitude to all governments was, in its essential principles, ^{the same}." (Cadoux - Pg. 35f)

^{stet} ~~bestehenden Ordnung der Dinge" (cf. id. PG 13 and Mathews 110f).~~ But in any case he recognizes in a great variety of ways the value of kings and governments." (Cadoux - Pg. 37)

Jesus criticized the ^{evils} of government, the injustice of judges, the ^{hypocrisy} and ^{maladministration} of rulers, and the iniquity of oppression and persecution. While He ^{discountenanced} the use of physical violence and punishment He seems "to have recognized that such methods are essential to all political government in an imperfect world." He utterly refused to use political means for His ends. He acted ^{wise} towards the State - whether Jewish or Herodian or Imperial - not as if it ^{was} objectively either the ^{perquisite} of Satan or the ^{sacrosanct} and ^{inviolable} institution of God, but on the assumption that ^{it} is merely the organization through which some section of His fellow men chose to express and enforce their collective will". Cadoux concludes his view of Jesus' attitude to the State with the words: "While fearlessly criticizing and condemning abuses, he does not condemn government as such. His own Church, on the contrary, resembled secular government in so far as it was an organization of superiors and subordinates framed for the purpose of checking and abolishing evil." (~~Footnote - Fre~~ ~~Jesus (ET), 55-54f)~~ ^(Cadoux, 37) but in founding that Church, he was setting on foot a movement so framed, that, granting the continuance of its growth, it would eventually make all governments--in the sense of institutions employing violence--needless and wrong. (~~Footnote - According to Weinel, Jesus~~

In a word Jesus recognized the State and desired to see a just and righteous and beneficent state but ^{civil} government was ^{only} a framework ^{within} which and beside which other institutions and forces were to produce a society which He called the Kingdom of God, ^{embracing} and including all goodness and no ^{evil} at all.

The passage from the Gospels to the Epistles is a passage from Judea to the Roman World and in Paul we meet one who was not only a Jew but also a citizen of the Empire. The great persecutions and the problems which they raised of the relation of Church and State ^{was} still in the future, but the growth of the Church and the relations of Christians to government and to civil authorities and institutions

This came later than the New Testament, ^{with} ~~without~~ the possible exception of the Book of Revelation, but not for one moment can we suppose that the counsel of the N.S. ever required obedience to civil authority, ~~could have been interpreted~~ to countenance any compromise, whether with idolatry, with the subjection of the Christian conscience to secular power, or with the crossing in any form whatever of the Empire and the State. The Christian had a higher citizenship than could be seen in secular legation, a law above all human law, and its institutions.

"Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers; for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God. Therefore he that resisteth the power, withstandeth the ordinance of God: and they that withstand shall receive to themselves judgment. For rulers are not a terror to the good work, but to the evil. And wouldst thou have no fear of the power? do that which is good, and thou shalt have praise from the same: for he is a minister of God to thee for good. But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is a minister of God, an avenger for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For for this cause ye pay tribute also; for they are ministers of God's service, attending continually upon this very thing. Render to all their dues: tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor". (Romans XIII - 1-7).

And Peter's ~~Council~~ agrees with Paul's:

"Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the kind, as supreme; Or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil doers, and for the praise of them that do well. For so is the will of God, that with well doing ye may put to silence the ignorance of foolish men: As free, and not using your liberty for a cloke of maliciousness, but as the servants of God. Honour all men. Love the brotherhood. Fear God. Honour the king." (I Peter, II - ~~13-17~~ 13-17).

At the same time these leaders of the Church exalted the principle of freedom which Christianity had brought and which was in later generations to bring forth ~~much~~ fruit little foreseen. Freedom was not to be abused or to ~~degenerate~~ into license (Gal. V. 13, I Th. IV. 11f: V, 14: II Th. III. 6-12: I Cor. VI, 12, x, 33f. I Peter II, 15f) but it was not to be lightly conceived or unworthily compromised. Peter and John refused to obey the ~~Sanhedrin~~ in its abridgment of their freedom of speech. (Acts IV, 19f). Peter declares "~~we~~ must obey God rather than man" (Acts V. 29). When ~~shortly~~ worship of the Emperor or some heathen God was demanded the Christian believer refused at the cost of life. Christians were admonished not to resort to litigation, especially in Secular Courts (I Cor. VI, 1-11).

"While we read of no Christian of this period entering upon official or military life after his conversion we find mention made of some already settled in such life being ~~commented~~ and (~~for as we are told to the contrary~~) remaining without reproach or ~~compunction~~ in their former stations" (Cadoux, pg. 114. Acts VIII, 27, 38f: X, XIII, 12, XVI, 27-34, XVII, 34, XVIII, 8; Rom. XVI, 10f 23, Phil IV, 22, Titus III, 13).

"These are--the eunuch of the Queen of Ethiopia, (Ac VIII. 27, 38f, ~~Whether Manaen, the foster-Brother of Herodes, who was a member of the church at Antioch (Ac XIII. I), held any sort of political office, we cannot say.~~) the centurion Cornelius, (Ac x.) Sergius Paulus, the proconsul of Cyprus, (Ac xxvii. 12.) the gaoler of Philippi, (Ac xvi. 27-34) Dionysius the Areopagite of Athens, (Ac xvii. 34.) Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue at Corinth, (Ac xviii, 8---or were his functions religious only, and not civil?) the Christians in the households of Narcissus and Aristobulus at Rome, (R xvi, 10f. Narcissus was the freedman and private secretary of the Emperor Claudius. Aristobulus was a member of the Herodian family and his domestic establishment may have been transferred to the imperial household; see Harnack ME ii. 45. It is, however, possible that R xvi. may be part of a letter sent to Ephesus (Moffatt INT 134-139; per contra, Sanday and Headlam scivf, 421ff), in which case the names of Narcissus and Aristobulus would be without significance here.) Erastus, the city-treasurer of Corinth, (R xvi. 23.) the saints belonging to Caesar's household, (P iv. 22.) Two of these are known to us by name from Clemens' letter to the Corinthians (lxiii. 3, lxxv. I)--Claudius Ephebus and Valerius Bito (Harnack ME ii. 44f). For Paul's allusion to the 'praetorium' (P i, 13), see below, p. 131 n 5.) and Zenas the lawyer. (P iii, 13.)" (Cadoux - Pg. 114)

Too much importance is not to be given to the absence of mention

of Christians entering political service after conversion. The substantial ~~main~~ fact in that the Christians did not regard civil service as incompatible with Christian discipleship. The equally substantial fact is that the State was not the institution, through which the ends of the Church were to be achieved. It had its place and its function but these were and are secondary to the place and function of the Christian fellowship and the Christian home.

It is important for Christians to day, not to be carried away by the exaltation of the State, both the totalitarian and the democratic state, into the supreme and authoritative institution and agency of Society. The State is not the supreme and absolute instrument of Society. Society itself is the seat and source of authority and the State is only one of the four great institutions - the State, the School, the Church and the Family. In a real sense these four are coordinate. If they are to be differentiated and arranged in the ascending order of their importance to Society the order just given is the right order. If any of them might be displaced such it is in the same order. The most important is the family, then the Church, the next the school, and last, the most costly, wasteful and inefficient of all, the civil and political instrument, ^{which} we call the State. Should any of these be maintained this was the order in which they came and in this order, when each fulfills its functions they stand in the matter of their value to Society. In its creation first of the ^{Christian} family, then of the Christian Church, then of the Christian school, Christianity laid the essential ~~social~~ foundations of a right society which are in peril today through the tolerated usurpation by the State of social functions better belonging to and better fulfilled by Society's more basic institutions.

OFFICERS
BOARD OF TRUSTEES

HUGH T. DOBBINS
PRESIDENT
ROBERT FREEMAN
FRANK I. TURNER
VICE PRESIDENTS
SAMUEL D. ARCHIBALD
SECRETARY-TREASURER

SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

SAN ANSELMO, CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY AND TREASURER
228 McALLISTER STREET
SAN FRANCISCO

August 4, 1939

Rev. Jesse H. Baird, D. D.,
San Francisco Theological Seminary,
San Anselmo, California.

My dear Dr. Baird:

In accordance with our telephone conversation this morning, I am enclosing a check in amount of \$600.00 for Dr. Speer, as honorarium for delivering the T. V. MOORE LECTURES.

You will recall that when the gift was accepted by the Board of Trustees, it was on the conditions set forth in the Trust, which read as follows:

"The other half shall be given to the TRUSTEES OF SAN FRANCISCO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, at San Anselmo, California, for the establishment of a foundation for a public lectureship, to be known as the T. V. MOORE LECTURES.

"Provided, that the Trustees of the said Seminary, in receiving this gift, shall agree to accepting it under the following conditions:

"The lectures shall be held at such times, and in such public places as shall be determined by the faculty of said Seminary, and shall be given by such persons as may be appointed by the TRUSTEES OF SAID SEMINARY upon nomination by the faculty subject to the subsequent conditions herein contained.

"The lectures shall be positive expositions or defenses of some aspect, or aspects, of Biblical Study or of Christian truth, and shall be given only by men who are known as sincere believers in what is known historically as the evangelical Reformed faith:

"Should the teaching in said Seminary, or in any of its departments at any time depart from any one of the three great Christian truths of (1) the supreme authority of the Bible, as a divine revelation, in matters of faith and conduct, (2) the unique and essential deity of Jesus Christ, as distinct from that of all other men, (3) His vicarious, propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the world, or should the faculty or Trustees of said Seminary permit such departure on the part of any one teaching under their authority, or lecturing on this foundation, or should the said Trustees decline to accept the money under these conditions, then said money shall at once vest in the aforesaid SOUTHWESTERN PRESBYTERIAN SANATORIUM, and this trust agreement shall then cease and determine.

"As a further condition to the acceptance of this sum, the Trustees of said Seminary shall agree to have the above conditions of the bequest read before the audience at the opening of each series of lectures given under the lectureship, as an indication of the abiding testimony of the Trustor to his faith and his purpose in founding said lectureship."